

A STUDY
OF THE
LATIN PRONOUNS IS AND HIC.

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN IN 1900

BY
CLARENCE LINTON MEADER.

ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN
PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHOR

A STUDY
OF THE
LATIN PRONOUNS IS AND HIC.

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN IN 1900

BY
CLARENCE LINTON MEADER.



ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN
PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHOR

ANN ARBOR PRINTING COMPANY
THE INLAND PRESS
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN

NOTE.

Those interested in the study of the changes of meaning in the Latin pronouns will find the matter of the present thesis, along with other contributions to the history of the pronouns, in the author's book entitled, "The Latin Pronouns *Is, Hic, Iste, Ipse*: A Semasiological Study." New York and London, The Macmillan Co., 1901. 8°. pp. xvi + 220.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

CHAPTER I. IS.

CHAPTER I. IS.

In the study of these pronouns we may profitably begin with the determinative *is*. It is the simplest in its elements (*cf.* **ol-so* > *ille*, **e-p-so* > *ipse*, **e-so-to* > *iste*, **ho-i-ce* > *hic*),¹ and in all the periods of the Latin language it is the weakest in meaning of the above mentioned pronouns (see Schmalz, *Lateinische Syntax* in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch der kl. Alt.* II.2, 3d ed. p. 444: "es schliff sich auch als kleines Wörtchen sehr bald so ab, dass es überhaupt fast ganz ausser Kurs kam"). Traces of an original stronger demonstrative force are not far to seek. We may mention the familiar use of *is qui* in the sense approaching that of *talis ut* (see Harpers' *Latin Lexicon s. v.* for citations from Cicero, and add Sen. Contr. 3,3; Vell. Pat. 2,82,2 *ea adiit pericula, a quibus seruari se posse desperauerat*; Plin. Epist. 3,12,4; Gerber and Greef, *Lex Tac.* p. 709 *d*) "*i. q. talis, eiusmodi*"). Still more clearly does this force of the pronoun appear when it serves to introduce an *ut*-clause, as in Plaut. Capt. 934f.

Pater, et petere a te ego potero et di eam potestatem dabunt, [res.

Ut beneficium bene merenti nostro merito mune-

¹These are the derivations accepted by Stolz (*Historische Grammatik*, 1894).

Such passages are rare in Plautus; a second instance is Poen. 1186 *eo genere*. Later examples are: Nepos, Them. 6,1 (*cf.* Lupus, *Der Sprachgebrauch d. C. Nepos* p. 110); Vell. Pat. 2,90,4; Plin. Epist. 6,6,8; 6, 14,1 *ea conditione ne*; Tac. Dial. 23,20 *ita...ea...is...ea...ea...is...ea...sic...sic..., ut...*; Ann. 1,6,20 (see G. and G., *Lex. l. c.*); Censorinus 1,6; Justin 37,1,7; Script. Histor. Augustae, Geta 7,4 *etc.*; Tertullian, *Ad Nationes* 1,7*p*; Lactantius, *De Opificio Dei* 4,3; 12; Ambrosius, *Exameron* 2,3,11 (27E); Augustine, Epist. 22,4*m bis*; Alcimus Avitus 7(6), p. 35,12(P); Boethius, *De Consolatione Philosophiae* 1,6*pr.*, 28. A stronger demonstrative force, approaching the normal meaning of *ille*, is also to be observed in such passages as Plaut. Trin. 746

....atque ea condicio uel primariast;

Amph. 781

Haec east profecto patera;

Caecil. Statius, 28 f. (p. 33R) (*apud* Cicero, *De Sen.* 25 and Nonius 1,20)

Tum equidem in senecta hoc deputo miserrimum,
Sentire ea aetate ipsum esse odiosum alteri.

Cf. Virg. Aen. 3,393. In other instances the stronger demonstrative force of the pronoun is evident from the fact that the word it modifies is contrasted with another (*cf.* Plaut. Stich. 239-241; Men. 574), or is itself repeated (*cf.* Asin. 179; Truc. 122; Trin. 238; Ovid, Met. 7,43 f). With the demonstrative *hic* such a repetition is very common in all periods both with poets and prose writers (Plaut. Men. 132; Horace often). *Ille* is not so often repeated in this way as

hic. The repetition of the determinative is uncommon. These and similar types of construction, in which the determinative bears traces of a stronger force, are met in all periods of the literature.

In dealing with the semasiological and syntactical changes of this pronoun, it will be necessary, as the sequel will show, to draw a sharp distinction both between the usage of the prose writers and of the poets, and between the various subdivisions of these two great branches, *e. g.*, between technical prose, history and oratory; between the epos (in the narrower sense), satire, lyric poetry, *etc.* Within these smaller groups again it will be advisable to distinguish the chronological relations of the authors. There is entire justification for thus classifying the Roman prose literature; for, while a classification of modern prose literature on the basis of the prominence of poetical or rhetorical characteristics would doubtless lead to great confusion and many inconsistencies, the case was entirely different with the Greeks and the Romans. This is apparent from the two passages Cic. De Leg. 1,5 opus (*sc.* historiae) unum hoc oratorium maxime; Quintilian 10, 1,31 historia est proxima poetis et quodam modo carmen solutum. For further details on the style of historical composition in antiquity see Norden, *Die Antike Kunstprosa* I,81-95. The poetical coloring of Livy, particularly of the first decade, will at once occur to the reader, although it must not be overlooked that the Augustan historian adopted a more sober style after he had completed the first decade, the subject matter of which was poeticis magis decora fabulis quam incorruptis rerum gestarum monumentis.

It will also be recalled that the details of the complete history of Rome which Cicero and Atticus contemplated writing conjointly, were so arranged that Atticus was to establish the historical facts, while Cicero was to furnish the rhetorical embellishments (*cf.* the correspondence with Atticus for the year 45 and Plutarch's Cicero 41).

A. *IS* IN POETRY.

We take up first the use of *is* in the poetical literature of the Romans, because it is here that we find the most striking proofs of the weakening of its force and its gradual disuse. The French editor Dacier appears to have been the first to call attention to the fact that the expression *eius atque* in Horace, Ode 3, 11, 18 is unpoetical. The eminent Bentley in his note on this passage says: "*sed poetae epici, magno sane cum iudicio, uocabulum hoc perpetuo mulctarunt exilio; ne heroici carminis maiestatem humi serpere cogèrent; utpote singulis fere periodis recursurum, ni stilo subintelligerentur extrinsecus, neque praesentia sua uersus inquinaret. inde est quod in toto Uirgilio ne semel quidem occurrit eius, bis duntaxat in Ouidio, ut Trist. 3, 4, 27.*" (a third, but doubtful passage is Met. 8, 16) "*...eo tamen peius noster (i. e. Horace), et quod in carmine lyrico longe supra Ouidii elegos surgere debuerit, et quod...*" Adolf Kiessling's note on *eius* in O. 4, 8, 18 in part confirms, in part contradicts and in part expands Bentley's affirmation: "*der sonst der Sprache der Oden, wie überhaupt gehobenem Ausdruck fremde Gebrauch von is (doch scheut die Elegie das Pronomen nicht) mag hier durch den scherzhaften Zug, der durch das ganze Gedicht geht, sich entschuld-*

igen lassen." Bentley does not comment on this passage. Kiessling brackets the stanza in which eius occurs, 3,11,18. As for the reason that led the poets to avoid this word, both Kiessling and Bentley hint vaguely that it is unpoetical. Bentley seems to be condemning only the form eius, while Kiessling's statement may be understood to include all the forms of the pronoun. I know Dacier's attitude only from Schütz, 3d ed. (1889), p. 402. Grosrau, Sprachlehre, §382, H, Anm. 2 makes a somewhat more definite and detailed statement: "Wie et id, idque auf den ganzen Satz bezogen, so steht isque am Anfang des Satzes scharf hinweisend bei Cicero, häufig bei Virgil, 1,215; 3,596; 4,203; 6,684 *et al.* Sonst haben die Dichter höheren Stiles das Wort vermieden, *da es nur formelle Beziehung, keine eigentliche Bedeutung hat*" (the italics are mine). Quite a different reason is assigned by Schmalz, *l.c.* "Is war den Dichtern unbequem, weil es sich nicht gut in den Vers fügt, und so meiden es Catull, Virgil, Horaz, Lucan, auch der Metriker Terentian, sichtlich." This statement seems to be a somewhat misleading abridgment of Obermeier, *Der Sprachgebrauch des M. Annaeus Lucanus*, p. 15: "Ohne Zweifel war dieses Pronomen...zu unbequem da sich seine obliquen Casus nur schlecht in den Hexameter fügten." The questions suggested by all these inadequate statements are numerous and render imperative a careful examination of the entire problem.

In the investigation of this question it will be necessary first, as suggested above, to determine the relative frequency of is in the poets as compared with that in the prose writers.

Proceeding chronologically let us begin with a review of the usage of the early poets. Taking a selection from their extant works and fragments large enough to be representative, we obtain the following table of percentages:¹

	hic	is	ille	ipse	iste	idem
Comicorum fragmenta ed. Ribbeck	42	25	20	4	7	2½
Tragicorum " " "	33	30	16	10	6	5
Plautus, Captivi	40	26½	16	3⅓	13	1½
" Casina	34	29	22	2⅓	12	1
" Menaechmi	43	20	18½	4⅓	12	2½
" Trinummus	30⅓	33	18¾	7⅓	9	1⅓
" average of the above	37	27½	18½	4⅓	11½	1⅓
Ennii fragmenta	38	23	17½	10	3½	7

This table is based upon the following total number of occurrences of these pronouns: Comici 319, Tragici 187, Captivi 422, Casina 254, Menaechmi 372, Trinummus 500, (excluding prologues); Ennius 153.

It will be seen from this table that the pronoun *is* occurs more frequently than any of the others with the exception of *hic*, and in one instance, that of the *Trinummus*, more frequently than *hic*. Ennius' use of *is* will be discussed more in detail below.

Lucretius in his usage of these pronouns holds a place very near the archaic poets, a circumstance which is of importance as furnishing further evidence of his sympathies with these writers, and showing his dependence upon them. In books 1, 2, 3, 6 of his poem the above pronouns occur in the following proportions:

hic 34, *is* 25, *ipse* 20, *ille* 14, *idem* 8, *iste* 0. In

¹ It has not been thought necessary to make the percentages in the tables exact to a small fraction of one per cent. Accordingly their sums sometimes slightly exceed or fall below a hundred.

Catullus, however, we find an important change. His complete works give us:

	hic	ille	ipse	is	idem	iste
	39	25¼	15½	12⅔	4⅓	2¾
with which <i>cf.</i> Cæsar	20	9½	14	50½	6	⅓

It will be observed that in Catullus *is* occupies the fourth rank, being less frequently used than either *hic*, *ille* or *ipse*. The *Aratea*, a translation made by Cicero in his earlier years, although antedating Catullus, shows a much stricter avoidance of the word. In the fairly extensive fragments of the *Aratea* (about 550 lines) that have come down to us, *is* is met with only three times: verse 250 (*is*), frag. XV (*eius*), verse 315 (*eum*); while in Catullus (about 2000 verses, many of them much shorter than Cicero's hexameters) it occurs 42 times. This apparent inconsistency in the usage of Cicero and Catullus disappears, however, when we distinguish between the latter's "*Nugæ*" and his longer poems in hexameters (No. 62 *Uesper adest* and No. 64 *Epithalamium Pelei*). These two poems, which make up about one-fourth of the Catullus-corpus show but a single instance of *is* (64, 122), since the word *eius* is unquestionably corrupt in v. 109 of the *Epithalamium*.

Having thus determined the date at which *is* begins to be less frequently used in poetry, we may now proceed to distinguish the various branches of poetry and to set forth in tabular form the whole number of occurrences of the determinative pronoun in (a) satire, (b) didactic epos, (c) elegy, (d) historical and heroic epos, (e) ode.

SATIRE (with related branches).

Horace, ¹ Sat. and Epist.	31	instances	to	ca. 4000	verses,	or	1	to	130 vv.
Persius	6	"	"	475	"	"	1	"	80
Juvenal	4	"	"	3800	"	"	1	"	950
Martial	5	"	"	8600	"	"	1	"	1720

DIDACTIC EPOS.

Cicero, Aratea	3	instances	to	ca. 550	verses,	or	1	inst.	to 180vv
Virgil, Georgica	9	"	"	2200	"	"	1	"	245
Manilius	24	"	"	4200	"	"	1	"	170
Germanicus	1	"	"	950	"	"	1	"	950
Epos Aetna	1	"	"	654	"	"	1	"	654
Grattius, Cynegetica	2	"	"	540	"	"	1	"	270
Serenus Sammonicus	1	"	"	1100	"	"	1	"	1100
Nemesianus	2	"	"	672	"	"	1	"	336
Auianus, Fabulae	2	"	"	654	"	"	1	"	327

ELEGY and IDYL.

Virgil, Bucolica	2	inst.	to	ca. 800	verses,	or	1	inst.	to 400
Tibullus	5	"	"	1900	"	"	1	"	380
Lygd. and Panegyrr.	2	"	"	400	"	"	1	"	200
Sulpicia	1	"	"	300	"	"	1	"	300
Propertius ²	13	"	"	4100	"	"	1	"	315
Ovid, Amores	2	"	"	2450	"	"	1	"	1225
" Tristia, Pont.	66	"	"	6250	"	"	1	"	95
Statius, Silvae	6	"	"	3900	"	"	1	"	650
Calpurnius	1	"	"	760	"	"	1	"	760

EPOS (historical and heroic).

Aeneid	1	instance	to	ca. 125	verses
Ovid, Metamorphoses	1	"	"	165	
Lucan, Pharsalia	1	"	"	1330	
Valerius Flaccus	1	"	"	220	
Statius, Thebais	1	"	"	320	
Statius, Achilleis	1	"	"	1125	
Silius, Punica, B'ks 1-10 and 17	1	"	"	190	
Ilias Latina	1	"	"	500	
Dracontius, Carm. Profana	1	"	"	600	
Claudianus	1	"	"	5000	

¹In the same lines hic occurs 350 times.²Propertius 2,24,51 is now read Hi or Ni instead of Ii.

It might at first thought seem to the reader that the number of occurrences of *is* in Ovid's *Ex Ponto* and *Tristia* is too large to warrant the assertion that the poet avoided the pronoun. The relative smallness of this number, however, is apparent at a glance, when we note that on an equal number of pages of Caesar the pronoun occurs about 800 times.

The following are the precise references to the passages in which *is* occurs, only, however, for those authors who employ the word but a small number of times:

Persius 6,16 ob id. 3,95 quidquid id est. 6,65 quidquid id est. 2,71 id. 3,48 id. 5,97 id quod.

Juvenal 3,182 id uitium. 6,413 id uitium. 7,162 quidquid id est. 10,183 id.

Martial 2,30,5. 7,31,12. 14,145,1; in all three cases *is* or *id* at the beginning of a line. 3,1,1. 6,68,11; in both instances the formula *quidquid id est*. In addition to these passages it occurs twice in the prose introductions. Friedländer's index is misleading, since it cites only two examples.

Virgil, *Georgica* 1,432 *is*. 2,239 *eā*. 263 *id*. 3,252 *eos*. 289 *eā*. 510 *eā*. 4,89 *eum*. 334 *eam*. 430 *eum*.

Germanicus, *Phaenomena* 32 *eas*.

Aetna 253 *eā*.

Gratius 224 *eius*. 363 *id*.

Serenus Sammonicus 1095 *id*.

Nemesianus, *Cynegetica* 212 *quicquid id est*. 298 *id*.

Avianus 2,2 *eam*. 20,5 *is*. (*varia lectio* 40,4).

Virgil, *Bucolica* 3,35 *id quod*. 9,37 *id quidem*.

Tibullus 1,2,39 *f is bis*. 6,25 *eius*. 10,66 *is*. 2,3,33 (36) *quisquis is es*.

Lygdamus 3,4,94 Isque. 6,12 eum.

Sulpicia 4,7,8 id.

Ovid, Amores 3,4,3 ea. 15,5 Si quid id est.

Statius, Siluae 1,4,53 ea. 6,49 quisquis is est. 5, 1,219 Is. 5,65 Quisquis is est. In verse 1,2,180 ea is a conjecture of Bährens for et, and, like Uerum id, at (for uerum erat) 5,5,49, is not accepted by Vollmer.

Calpurnius, Ecl. 4,12 Quidquid id est.

Lucan 1,171 is. 2,726 Non ea. 3,611 eam. 4,546 eum. 7,406(eo=propterea). 10,265 non id (*uaria lectio* ita). The poorer MSS. show forms of is in 3,228. 6,733. 828. 9,538. 1062. The passages in the sixth, seventh and tenth books are overlooked by Obermeier, *l. c.*

Statius, Achilleis 1,811(=2,137) Is

Ilias Latina 22 eius. 640 idque.

Dracontius 5,271 Id quod. 6,57 Uix ea fatus eram.

Claudianus XXXIII(=Proserp. 1,117). XXVIII, 558.

To these tables might have been added the Disticha Catonis and the Carmina De Figuris and De Ponderibus. These show one instance of is to every thirty-five to seventy lines, a frequency easily accounted for by the prosaic character of the subject matter and the carelessness of metrical treatment. In Corippus it is rarely used (examples: Ioan. 2,326 ea; 6,255 Uix ea; 8,33; 127 Uix ea; Laud. Iust. 1,79). The same is true of Cyprian's Heptatuch (Genesis 1039 Is qui; 1347 Id; Deuteronomy 57(953) id). In view of the strictness with which Cyprian avoided this word one should hesitate long before accepting Mayor's conjecture of is qui for ille qui Deuteronomy 124. 5(=1040f). In

the poetical portions of Boethius, *De Consolatione Phil.* it does not occur. On the avoidance of the word by the Satirists see Šorn, *Der Sprachgebrauch des Eutropius*, II,4. For Commodian see below.

The discrepancy between Ovid's *Amores* and his *Tristia* is perhaps to be explained by the circumstance that the former were written at Rome at the beginning of his career, at a time when he was strongly under the influence of his early rhetorical training, the latter in exile in his later years, at a time when his style was less careful. In putting forward this explanation, however, we must not fail to remember that the *Metamorphoses*, which is the last poem Ovid wrote before his exile, shows a comparatively frequent use of the determinative.

Before inquiring in detail what the above tables teach us concerning the use of this pronoun in the poets, it remains only for me to point out the striking contrast between the usage of the early poets discussed above (p. 8) and typical later poets. This contrast is clearly brought out by the following table:

	hic	is	ille	ipse	iste	idem
Tragicorum frag.	33	30	16	10	6	5
Comicorum frag.	42	25	20	4	7	2
Catullus	39	12	25	15	2	6
Virgil, <i>Aen.</i> III	49	5	23	14	3	5
Silius, Bks. VIII and IX	58	3	20 $\frac{1}{3}$	12	1	5 $\frac{2}{3}$
Lucan, Bks. II and III	60 $\frac{2}{3}$	1	19	13	3	2 $\frac{2}{3}$

Let us now see what the above tables teach with reference to the attitude of the poets toward this pronoun.

If the suggestions of Bentley and Grosrau cited above are true (*cf.* the words “*epici carminis maiestatem—inquinaret*”—“*höheren Stiles*”—“*keine eigentliche Bedeutung*”), we must in order to be consistent in detail, assume that the higher forms of poetry should be stricter in their avoidance of the word than those branches which do not rise so lofty above the *sermo pedestris*. Such a condition of affairs is precisely what we find reflected very clearly in the detailed table for Catullus above. We likewise find the determinative all but banished from Horace’s Odes, while it is far less rigidly excluded from the Epistles and the Satires, as the two passages above mentioned are the only ones in the Odes in which it occurs. But, since the usage found in the works of Ennius (see below page 16) is slightly different, the evidence of such a distinction is limited to these two instances. Virgil employs it more rarely in his Georgics than in the Aeneid, though on the general theory we should expect the contrary. Juvenal in his Satires is much more sparing of it than the writers of the heroic epos, Statius and Valerius Flaccus, while Martial, the writer of epigrams, avoids the word more strictly than any other Roman poet except Claudian and Boethius. In fact each of the branches distinguished above shows great variety within itself. The average number of lines corresponding to each occurrence of it varies in the

Satire, <i>etc.</i>	from	80	to	1720
Didactic Epos	from	170	to	1100
Elegy and Idyl	from	95	to	1200
Heroic and Hist. Epos	from	125	to	1300 ^b

¹ If we include Claudian, 5000.

Any attempt to establish a general canon based on the distinction of genera is therefore seen to be futile. If we disregard the genera and undertake to determine some principle based on chronology, we shall likewise be unsuccessful in discovering a regularly operating principle. However, in general, it is perfectly clear that the post-Augustan poets and especially the later writers, are much more strict in the exclusion of the pronoun than the Augustan. Compare, *e. g.*, Martial (1×1720)¹ with Horace (1×130); Statius, *Silvae* (1×650) with Tibullus (1×380), with Propertius (1×320) or with Virgil's *Bucolics* (1×400); Lucan (1×1430) with Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (1×165); and Dracontius (1×1200) with Virgil's *Aeneid* (1×125). In other words, the rule of composition, for such we must call it, was more strictly applied as time went on, and as originality played an increasingly less prominent part in Roman literature. We shall be impressed with the comparative rarity of *is* in poetry, when we consider that Cæsar alone has over two thousand instances of *is*, even omitting the forms *hi* and *his*, which in a large number of cases undoubtedly represent original *ii* and *iis* or *eis*, against Horace's 34 and Virgil's 75.

An examination of the usage of the poets with a view to determining whether they observed any distinction in the use of the special cases reveals some striking facts. Certain forms of *is* are rigidly avoided, while for others a strongly marked preference is shown. This preference for certain cases is seen in some writers long before any tendency to avoid the word as a whole is observable. Ennius for example, if we are

¹ *i. e.*, one instance in 1720 verses.

justified in making deductions from the somewhat limited number of extant fragments of his works, observes a careful distinction in the use of the forms of *is*, as employed in his Hexameters on the one hand and in his Dramas, the tone of which approaches that of the vernacular, on the other. In the fragments of the *Annals* (600 verses) only the forms *is*, *ea* and *eos* and the monosyllabic forms *sam*, *sas*, *sos*, *sum* occur, there being in all fifteen instances. In the *Satires* (86 verses) only *is* occurs (four times). In the *Fabulae* the word occurs about as often as in the *Annals*, but with this marked difference: the form *is* is used only once, *ea* only once, *id* four times, while the forms *ei*, *eum*, *eo*, *eis*, entirely excluded from the *Annals*, occur seven times, the forms with the initial sibilant being entirely rejected. The facts are most evident in tabulated form (based on L. Müller's edition, 1884):

	Ann. Sat.	Fab.
Monosyllabic forms and <i>ea</i>	18	7
Other forms	1 (<i>eos</i>)	7

In view of the somewhat scanty fragments of *Ennius* one might be tempted to regard the above mentioned conditions as a result of chance, did he not find them strikingly confirmed by the usage of the later poets. To make this clearer we here insert a tabulated statement of the relative frequency of the cases of *is* in the Augustan and post-Augustan poets mentioned in the above tables with the exception of the *Tibullus*-corpus, *Propertius*, *Horace* and *Manilius*, who are not so rigid in the exclusion of the oblique cases, and with the addition of *Ennius' Annals*, *Ca-*

tonis Disticha, the Carmina de Figuris, de Ponderibus and de VII Planetibus, Namatianus and Priscian's Periegesis. For the sake of comparison with a standard prose-writer we adjoin in a parallel series the figures giving the relative frequency in Caesar. Number of instances:

	is (sam, etc.)	ea	id	eum, eam	eo, ea	eos, eas	other forms	total
Caesar	50	90	175	245	360	185	940	2045
Poets	104	150	112	22	15	5	2	410

For Caesar the occurrences are stated in round numbers and include the Pseudo-Caesarian Bell. Alex., Bell. Afr., and Bell. Hisp. The two isolated cases in the poets are eius from Ovid, Ex Ponto 4, 15, 6 (omitted in Heinze's text) and Ilias Latina 2, 2. The above figures yield the following percentages:

Caesar	2½	4½	8½	12	17½	9	46	100
Plautus	15	5½	30	19½	7	3½	19½	100
Poets	25¼	36½	27½	5½	3½	1¼	½	100

In this table Plautus is represented only by the four plays tabulated above. The forms eius and ei (Dative) make up seventeen per cent. of the nineteen and one-half per cent. in the last column but one. If we now include in the poets the totals for the Tibullus-corpus, Propertius, Horace and Gratius, the proportions remain still not very materially altered:

	is	ea	id	eu(a)m	eo(a)	other forms	
Occurrences:	118	152	144	36	22	20	492
Percentages:	24	31	29¼	7¼	4½	4	100

We observed above that the determinative as a whole is avoided by the poets. The last two tables show

that in the handling of the special cases also careful discrimination was made.

Certain forms of *is* have entirely disappeared, others are rarely used, while still others have become decidedly less frequent than in prose. On the other hand a marked preference is shown for the monosyllabic forms *is* and *id* and for the pyrrhic *ea*. With these three forms the poets have in fact developed a number of formulae that find frequent employment. Among the more common of these may be mentioned:

- 1 *is* *isque*, *id* *que*. Ennius, Lucretius, Tibullus, Virgil, Ovid, Statius, Silius.
- 3 *atque is*. Statius, Silius.
- 4 *atque ea*. Lucretius, Virgil, Ovid, Statius, Silius.
- 5 *uix ea* (often followed by *fatus erat*). Virgil, Ovid, Statius, Dracontius.
- 6 *dumque ea*. Statius, Silius.
- 7 *quidquid id (is) est (es)*. Lucretius, Tibullus, Virgil, Statius, Nemesianus, Avianus, Calpurnius.

Of these nos. 1, 2, 5, 6 are of quite frequent occurrence, there being nearly one hundred instances in all. None of them, however, are found in Lucan. The form *ea* shares with other pyrrhic words the peculiarity of often filling the last two short syllables of the fourth foot of the hexameter. Thus is formed the cadence $\sim \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim =$ so common in our epics. Examples are: Virgil, *Aen.* 2, 17 *ea fama uagatur*; 3, 505 *ea cura nepotes*; 660 *ea sola uoluptas*; 4, 379 *ea cura quietos*; 2, 123 *ea numina diuom*; 3, 100 *ea moenia quaerunt*; 12, 216 *ea pugna uideri*; Ovid, *Met.* 6, 154 *ea cuncta placerent*;

8,123 ea fabula: uerus; 15,64 ea pectoris hausit, *etc.*, *etc.*; Statius, Thebais 2,73; 4,242; Valerius Flaccus 3,223; 455; 4,144; 6,18; 7,108; 8,43.

Compare with this peculiarity the observation made by Edwards, *The Ablative of Quality and the Genitive of Quality in Latin*, New York, 1900, p. 39, that the Ablative of quality corpore stands nearly always in the fifth foot of the hexameter, because of the impossibility in many instances of employing the Genitive in this position. Whatever may have been the reason or reasons that led the poets to distinguish between the Ablative and the Genitive construction,¹ the

¹ It is evident that the choice between these two constructions, if determined simply by the technique of prosody, must depend, in Virgil and the later writers at least, upon the character (vocalic or consonantal) of the initial vowel of the following word. As a matter of fact, in Lucretius 1,1-300 the dissyllabic words with initial consonant that follow a dactylic word in the fifth foot of the hexameter are about three times as frequent as the words with initial vowels in the same position (in Virgil 1, 1-300 the proportion is about two of the former to one of the latter). There would accordingly be more opportunity on an average to employ the Ablative, *if the choice were determined merely by the character of the following word*. Is it not more likely that the reverse would be the case, and that the character of the final dissyllable would be determined by the use of the Ablative or the Genitive in the fifth foot? Or, if Lucretius was forced to use a word like posse in the sixth foot, would he have found any difficulty in writing 1,488 solidi reperiri corpori' posse?

Since writing the above, I have laid this question before Dr. Edwards, who agrees with me that Lucretius was not constrained by the metre to write corpore, referring to 2,53 rationi' potestas and 2,623 numini' diuæ. He urges, however, and rightly enough, that the influence of Lucretius, and particularly of Virgil, on subsequent usage must have been great.

appearance of the word *corpore* so often in the fifth foot is easy of explanation. In the Latin hexameters a dactylic word often forms the fifth foot (about 230 cases in Lucretius 1,1-300, Virgil 1,1-300 and Juvenal, Satire 1), less frequently in the first foot (about 80 cases in the same lines) seldom in the fourth (12 cases) and very rarely in the second and third (no cases). It is a question then of the diaeresis and the penthemimeral caesura. Applying these conditions to the pronoun *is*, we may readily conjecture that, if no elision takes place (elision occurs very rarely; so Ovid Met. 2,785 and Silius 7,160—In both cases it also precedes the diaeresis), the form *ea* will stand only in a foot that is followed by the diaeresis, *i. e.*, in the fifth, fourth and first often, in the third less frequently, in the second very rarely. What we actually find is that out of 86 instances of *ea* 48 fall in the first foot, 28 in the fourth foot, 8 in the third and 2 in the second. The excess of the occurrences in the first foot over those in the fourth (we might have expected the reverse) is accounted for by the frequent use of *is* as a correlative. Thus out of the 201 passages in which various forms of *is* occur in Ennius, the Tibullus-corpus, Propertius, Virgil, Ovid, Lucan, Statius and Silius, 118 fall to the first foot, 34 to the fourth, 25 to the second, 19 to the third, 5 to the fifth and none to the sixth. This also explains the absence of *is* from the sixth foot and its infrequent appearance in the fifth.

In addition to the cases of *is* counted in the comparison drawn between Caesar and the poets the following instances occur in metrical inscriptions:

id: Bücheler, *Carm. Epigraph.*, nos. 767; 995,26; 1009 *Quicquid id est*; 1031; 1258 *Idque* (= C. I. L. XII,2098; VI,12652; XI,1273 (ex schedis); VI,6592; 23004); Hübner, *Inscriptiones Hispaniae Christianae ex Zamorae schedis*.

eius: B. 765 (= C. I. L. XII,2143).

ei (dat.): B. 489 (monosyllabic); 492 (iambic) (= C. I. L. III,10501; 754).

eo (for eum): B. 474 (= *Ephem. Epigraph.* IV, p. 346, no. 936).

ea: B. 774 (= C. I. L. VIII,684).

Taking up the forms in detail, we may now observe that the forms *is* and *ea* are among those less frequently found in prose. This is also true of *id*, but the contrast between the prose usage and that of the poets is not so marked in the case of this form. Most striking of all is the almost entire absence of *eius* in the poets, which is used by the prose writers more frequently than any other form, occurring, for example, in *Cæsar* upwards of three hundred times. It is fairly common in *Lucretius* (55 times in books 1-3; 6) and *Manilius* (12 times), who often employ it to fill the last foot of the hexameter. The only other poets of those cited in the above tables, who use it are: *Catullus* 84,5; *Tibullus* 1,6,25; *Propertius* 4,2,35; 4,6,67; *Horace*, *Satires* 2,1,70; 6,76; *Ovid*, *Trist.* 3,4,27; *ex Ponto* 4,15,6 (some manuscripts have *huius*—In *Met.* 8,16 *eius* is a questionable reading); *Gratius* 224. From this count the ante-classical poets and *Commodian* are also omitted. The latter shows marked peculiarities in his use of the word, as in his metrics in general. He uses *is*, however, spar-

ingly, showing the forms: *is* 4 times, *ea* 6 times, *eius* 3 times, *eo* 12, *earum* 5, *eos* 6, *eis* 3. Entirely missing from the poets are *ii(ei)* Nom. pl., *eae* and *eis*. Omitting Commodian and the inscriptions mentioned, *earum* occurs only in Catullus 63,54; Horace, Sat. 2,8,92; *eorum* only in Horace, Sat. 1,4,80; *eos* only Propertius 2,21,7; Horace, Epist. 2,1,67; Virgil, Georg. 3,252; Aen. 1,413; Carmen de Pond. 72; *eas* Horace, Sat. 1,10,14; *ei* (dat.) only Catullus 82,3; Ovid, Hal. 34. It is also worthy of comment that only the instance in the Carmen de Ponderibus and those in the inscriptions fall later than the Augustan age. This clearly shows not only that the later writers in metre avoided the word as a whole, but also that they were more rigid in the exclusion of the oblique cases just enumerated. As a matter of fact, in the entire post-Virgilian literature under discussion there are only five cases of *eum*, five of *eo*, one of *eius*, two of *ei*. Three of these fall to Lucan.

Considerable light is thrown upon the reasons for this attitude of the poets by the explanations of Wölfflin-Meader in the Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik XI,373 ff:

1) 'The nominative forms *ii*, *ei*, *eae* were indistinguishable in pronunciation, and hence in metrical value, from the Dative and from the Nominatives *hi* and *hae*. The poets' ears could hardly have felt the combination of sounds *eae* as an objectionable cacophony, since they frequently admit such forms as *meae*, *deae*, *etc.* *Iis* was avoided for the same reasons as *ii*.'

This point suggests one of the most interesting as

well as most important problems of textual criticism. The questions involved are a) at what time was the phonetic identity of *ii* and *hi*, *eae* and *hae*, *iis* and *his* (*hiis* also occurs) an accomplished fact? b) how far has this confusion operated at a later date to cause corruption in the manuscripts of the earlier writers? Weissbrodt, *De usu pronominum is et hic quaestio*, Progr. Bromberg, 1878, 79 has shown quite clearly that this confusion could scarcely have become general before the end of the second century A. D., although isolated cases of *hi* for *ii* and of *his* for *iis* are found much earlier. In the fourth and fifth centuries this confusion was very common, if not universal. The attempt of Hans Ziegel, *De is et hic pronominibus quatenus confusa sint apud antiquos*, Marburg, 1897, to bring order into the chaos must be regarded as a distinct advance. He endeavors to prove by the collation of certain manuscripts, that an unknown grammarian of the fourth or fifth century established some rules for the guidance of authors or scribes in the choice between the two sets of forms. Still his results cannot be accepted until they receive confirmation by the consultation of other manuscripts. If the question were one of orthography and phonetics only, it would be comparatively simple. It is, however, complicated by considerations of semasiology. The weakening of the force of *hic*, which will be treated in the following chapter, had in the classical period so far advanced as to render the interchange of the two words no uncommon occurrence. We may therefore not unreasonably inquire, whether the writers, though perfectly aware of the orthographical, phonetic and semasiological dis-

tinctions (however slight) between the two words, nevertheless deliberately chose his and hi in preference to iis and ii. One circumstance, which, so far as I am aware, has never been noted, is of great weight: in sentences of the type of Quint. 9,2,1 *nam mihi de his sententiarum figuris dicere in animo est, quae ab illo simplici modo indicandi recedunt*, other forms than his and hi are of the rarest occurrence, while these two forms are quite frequently met with (Compare, *e. g.*, the readings in Cato, *De Agricultura* 1,4; 18,6; 52,1; 66,2; 149,2; 158,2). We feel called upon to lay considerable stress upon this fact in view of the surprising persistency with which modern writers on Latin grammar cite instances of hi and his to prove the weakening of the meaning of hic. Very few writers quote instances of any other form. This extraordinary preponderance of the two forms hi and his would be more naturally brought about by manuscript corruption than by semasiological conditions contemporary with the author, since such conditions would be likely to affect all forms alike and not simply the two just mentioned. As no instance of iis or is (for iis) occurs in the poets mentioned above except the dramatists, it is very difficult to say whether the confusion in manuscript tradition has affected their works as well as those of the prose writers.'

2) 'The Nominative ei was coincident in form with the Dative ei.'

3) 'The Dative ei varied between the monosyllabic pronunciation (Lucilius 4,40(*Ei coni. M.*); 7,27; Ennius, *Fab.* 204 (Müller); Catullus 82,3), the iambic (Ovid, *Hal.* 34—Lucan avoids the Dative 6,172 by

using viro [Obermeier, *l. c.*]) and the spondaic (see Ritschl, *Opusc.* II, 419, where are quoted twenty-two examples from the comedians and seven from Lucretius).'

4) 'The forms eum, eam, eo, eā, eos, eas varied between the monosyllabic and the dissyllabic pronunciation, and eorum, earum were pronounced with and without synzezeis.'

5) 'Eius is still more uncertain in its pronunciation. It is monosyllabic (Cicero, *Arat. apud De Nat. Deor.* 2, 109) or pyrrhic under the republic (*cf.* Lachmann on *Lucr.* pp. 27; 161), while the normal Augustan pronunciation was trochaic.'

'To avoid such difficulties the poets excluded the forms in question entirely from their writings.' On the whole subject of the uncertainty and variety in pronunciation of the dissyllabic and trisyllabic forms of is see Bücheler, *Lateinische Declination*, index *s. vv.*

Positive evidence that the considerations just mentioned played a part in determining the poet to avoid the use of these metrically inconvenient forms of is, is found in the similar attitude of the poets toward idem. The evidence collected by Bücheler, *op. cit. s. vv. idem, eadem, etc.*, shows that we have no reason for supposing that the confusion in pronunciation of idem was any less than that of the determinative. On the contrary, the transference of the accent would tend still further to bring about the disappearance of the initial vowel of the oblique cases (compare the form of the *Nom. masc., sg. and pl. Dat.-Abl. pl. idem and isdem*—the normal forms employed in the hexameter—with the uncompounded *ii, eis, iis*, rarely or never

employed by the poets). The reduction of these two forms to dissyllables rendered their employment in metrical writings possible, or at least unobjectionable; and placed them, in fact, metrically on the same basis with *is* and *id*. Accordingly we frequently find them in poetry, while *ii* and *iis* are absolutely avoided. This is in itself sufficient proof that the difficulty of metrical treatment was the chief objection to the two simple forms. In Catullus, Tibullus-corpus, Propertius, Horace's Odes, Ovid's *Ex Ponto*, Martial and Juvenal the following forms of *idem* occur, if we may trust the indices: *idem* Nom. sg. and pl. 72 times; *eadem* Nom. sg. pl. and Acc. pl., 38; *isdem* Dat.-Abl. pl. 7 times; other forms, 13 (10 in Ovid and Juvenal.). Horace is less strict in the use of *idem*, precisely as he is less strict in the exclusion of *is* from his Satires and Epistles. I have no doubt that the examination of Virgil, Lucan, Silius, Statius and Valerius Flaccus would reveal still greater caution on the part of these writers in the use of *idem*.

While there can be no doubt that these considerations have played an important part in determining the exclusion of the determinative and the pronoun of identity from poetry, we must not overlook other considerations. It was a true feeling for the language that led Dacier to remark on the unpoetical character of *is*, and that led Bentley (if his opinion was not formed independently) to approve his judgment. The determinative does express in most cases only "*formelle Beziehung*," but it is going too far to add, as Grosrau does, that the word "*keine eigentliche Bedeutung hat*." To be sure, the word often adds so little

to the sentence that it may be dropped even in prose, yet the usage of the poets shows that here, as in prose, the word often has a more or less strong demonstrative force, "he and no other," sometimes approaching talis in meaning (*cf. supra*), while, *vice versa*, it is less frequently used as a simple correlative with qui. We occasionally find it where in classical prose we should expect ille or hic.

From correspondence with Professor Shorey, of the University of Chicago, I learn that the same feeling concerning the weakness of the meaning of certain words underlies his note on Horace O. 4,2,33 and the statement found on p. xix of the Introduction to his edition of Horace's Lyrics.

This discussion would be incomplete and perhaps misleading, if we should omit to state that even in prose the forms ei (ii) Nom. pl. and eae are extremely rare. In Caesar, for example, the two combined make up only $1\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. of the entire number of occurrences of the determinative, in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* only $1\frac{2}{3}$ per cent., in *Curtius* $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent., in *Florus* $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent., in *Apuleius* $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent., while they are entirely absent from *Fronto B'ks.* 1-5. Is their scarcity due to their disappearance (absorption) into the forms hi and hae, or to disuse caused by a weakening of meaning? The answer must pend the solution of the problem stated on pages 22 sq. It may further be added that even the form hae would from the bare fact of its being Nom. pl. fem. find rather infrequent use as a substantive either in prose or verse (more often in the latter), while both hi and hae would often be understood from the per-

sonal ending of the verb or represented by the relative *qui*, *quae*. The form *id*, on the other hand, was largely used in prose as well as in poetry (compare the numerical prominence of the neuters *hoc* and *haec*), yielding in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 25¼ per cent. of all instances of the determinative, in *Florus* 27, and in *Fronto* (and *M. Aurelius*), B'ks. 1-5, 29 per cent.

B. *IS* IN PROSE LITERATURE.

Although the prose literature of the Romans does not show peculiarities in the use of *is* so striking as those just discussed, yet some interesting and valuable facts may be learned from observing the attitude of the prose writers. An examination of the monuments shows that *is* is less and less frequently employed in proportion as the style passes from the cold and unimpassioned scientific exposition (legal literature, *Cato*, *De Agr.*, *etc.*) through the more lively historical narrative into the impassioned tone of oratory and rhetorical (declamatory) prose (*Seneca*). In fact it is *par excellence* the pronoun of the curial style. In all our preserved laws, formulae, *etc.*, *hic* hardly appears at all. When it does, it refers with few exceptions to the subject matter of the document itself. *Ille* occurs previous to the year 48 A. D. only three times in *Bruns' Fontes*. The passages are: *lex Cornelia de XX quaestoribus* (81 B. C.) 1, 5 *ollis hominibus* in which case *ollis* seems to have the force peculiar to formulae, "so and so"; *lex a vicanis Furfensibus templo dicta* (58 B. C.) 1. 3 *comulateis olleis legibus illeis regionibus* (in which case it certainly bears the meaning just mentioned)—*cf.* *Hermes* VII, p. 201,

where the style of this provincial document is discussed. In view of the extreme rarity of the word, one is surprised to meet with it in the Laws of the Twelve Tables 10,8 *ast im cum illo* (*i. e.*, *auro quo iuncti sunt dentes*) *sepeliet*. Aside from the question as to how much the text of the laws has been modernized, there is of course a possibility of corruption in the manuscripts of Cicero, where the passage is preserved. If the text is sound, the demonstrative may be justified by the contrast between the gold particularly mentioned in the sentence just cited, and the general prohibition *neue aurum addito*. Even after the date above mentioned *ille* appears rarely in the laws. In the S. C. Claudianum (48 A. D.), which really has the form of an address and not of a legal document, *ille* occurs four times. In the carelessly written decretum proconsulis Sardiniae (79 A. D.) there is an example; likewise in the S. C. Macedonianum (69-79 A. D.), where *illi* stands simply for *ei*; in the testamentum Galli (first century); in the testamentum Dasumii (108 A. D.); in the lex arae Iovis Salaritanae (137 A. D.), in which occurs the above cited formula *ollis legibus ollis regionibus*; in the epistula praefectorum praetorio (168 A. D.), where *illo* = *eo*; in the *lis fullonum de pensione solvendo* where *illud quod* = *id quod*; in the *gesta de aperiendo testamento* (474 A. D.), *quod . . . illud* = *quod . . . id*. It should be noted that only few of these are *public* documents, which keep closer to the classical usage.

Turning now to the writers of scientific prose we find the relative frequency of the six pronouns to be as follows:

	is %	hic %	ille %	ipse %	idem %	iste %
Cato	59½	23½	3	2	11	1
Vitruvius	64	22	⅓	5½	8	⅛
Gaius	64	15	4	8	8	1
Dictys Cretensis	70½	13	2¼	8½	4¾	¼
Dares Phrygius	72	11	7¼	6⅞	2⅞	⅞

In the first three cases *hi* and *his* are counted with *hic* although there can be no doubt that many of them should fall into the *is*-column. Owing to the confusion between *ii* and *hi*, *iis* and *his*, 73 and 11 would probably be a more exact proportion for Dictys Cretensis. In the case of Dares those instances of *hi* and *his* which undoubtedly represent original *ii* and *iis* are included in the 72 per cent. The last two writers are added not as scientific writers, but because their percentages approach nearest to those of Cato, *etc.* They may easily have used the pronoun *is* so largely in order to give their writings a flavor of antiquity.

The historians in their employment of these pronouns show some marked differences:

	is %	hic %	ille %	ipse %	idem %	iste %
Caesar	50½	20½	9½	14	6	⅛
Curtius	36	21	16½	18¾	7	⅞
Suetonius	55¾	18¼	6⅔	14	5⅓	⅓
Justin	35	22	14⅓	16⅓	12	⅓
Victor	50½	22	9	11	7	1

*The pronouns *ille* and *ipse* are decidedly more fre-

quent,—it could not be otherwise in historical literature,—while is has decreased. The less frequent employment of is by Curtius and Justin could be easily accounted for. The African Latinity of Florus and his poetical coloring, for which see Archiv f. lat. Lex. u. Gram. VI, 1 ff. [Wölfflin], removes him widely from these. He shows:

17 24 26 27½ 5¼ ¼

With him, as with Catullus, is holds the fourth place instead of the first, its position being usurped by ille and ipse. He represents the extreme phase of a movement, which has left clear traces of its influence on the historical and particularly on the patristic literature. A medial position is occupied by the following writers:

	is %	hic %	ille %	ipse %	idem %	iste %
Seneca Rhetor	13⅔	35⅓	35	6	3⅓	6⅔
Pliny, Epistulae	16	34	23	16	6½	4½
Macrobius, Som. Scip.	16	47	11½	15½	8¾	2
Boethius, De Consol.	23½	35½	20½	13	3½	1½

The facts told by these tables require no comment. The following chapters will be found to describe in detail the semasiological changes that explain, to a large extent at least, the shifting of the predominance in usage from one pronoun to another.

Concerning the weakening of is in particular, those interested may consult Praun, Bemerkungen zur Syntax des Vitruv p. 83; Šorn, Der Sprachgebrauch des Historikers Eutropius, part II, p. 3; and Hoppe, Program, p. 8.

I can cite no writer in whose works is has so far

been replaced by *hic*, *ille* and *ipse* as in those of the grammarian Pompeius. In his writings it is confined almost entirely to certain set formulae or phrases. As a free and independent word it is nearly extinct. The following table is based on the first 108 pages of Keil's edition of Pompeius.

	<i>is</i>	<i>hic</i>	<i>ille</i>	<i>ipse</i>	<i>idem</i>	<i>iste</i>	totals.
Number of instances:							
Cæsar and							
continuator	2.73	2045	830	382	525	277	5
	749	304	140	189	101	2	1485
Pompeius	24	425	430	235	35	335	1484
Percentages:							
Cæsar, <i>etc.</i>	50½	20½	9½	14	6	⅛	
Pompeius	1¾	27¾	28¾	17½	2¼	22	

The conclusions which are to be drawn from this table are to be found in chapter III.

In reference to the disappearance of the individual forms of *is*, little is to be said beyond the remarks on the forms *ii*, *iis*, *eae* made above. It is well known that in later Latin the form *eum* (neuter) made on the analogy of *ipsum*, *bellum*, *etc.*, usurps the place of the form *id*, except in the phrase *id ipsum* (= Italian *desso*) and probably a few other formulae. Examples are cited by Geyer, *Kritische und sprachliche Erläuterungen zu Antonini Plac. Itin.*, p. 41.

CHAPTER II. HIC.

CHAPTER II. HIC.

A. THE RIVALRY BETWEEN HIC AND IS.

The encroachment of *hic* on the province of *is* is most clearly demonstrable in the case of certain short formulae or phrases, in which the neuter Nominative, Accusative or Ablative is used to refer not to some particular word, but to the general idea of the following or the preceding sentence or clause. Such phrases are *eo* (= *ideo*, *propterea*), *hoc* (= *ideo*, *propterea*), both either with or without a following *quia*, *quod*, *ut*, *ne*, *etc.*; *eo* with the comparative, *hoc* with the comparative; *id est*, *hoc est*, both explanatory; *ad id*, *ad hoc* with various meanings; *ob id*, *ob hoc*; *postea*, *postidea*, (*post id*, *post eă*), *posthac* (*post hoc*, *p. haec*—also *postillă* and *illă*); *eiusmodi*, *huiusmodi*; and lastly *eo consilio*, *hoc consilio*, the last two not being frequently employed. These are all special cases under the general principle stated by Kühner, *Lat. Gram.*, § 118, 2 Anm. 7 and 8 (= vol. II, p. 455). The first five pairs form the subject of the present section.

1. *Eo=ideo, hoc=ideo.*

The causal use of these two Ablatives is fully developed as early as Plautus, not to mention the doubtful passage in the *lex XII tabularum* 2,2 *morbus sonticus aut dies status cum hoste quid*

horum fuit uitium iudici reoue, eo dies || die || diffensus || diffissus, Th. Mommsen || esto. Examples of hoc = ideo are:

Pseud. 807¹ Illum (*sc.* coquum) conducunt (homines)
potius qui uilissumust.

Hoc ego fui hodie solus obsessor fori;

819 ff. Ei homines cenas.....

.....condiunt.....strigibus,

.....conuiuis intestina quae exedint.

Hoc hic quidem homines tam breuem uitam
colunt;

Miles 850

....ego promebam postea,

Hoc illi crebro capite sistebant cadi;

Hoc is here a probable and generally accepted conjecture of Brix 2d ed. for the MSS. hic. Cist. 319 ff.

Nam hasce aedis conductas habet meus gnatus,
haec ubi astat. [nominauit.

Hoc hanc eam esse opiniost: nam haec illum

I cite these passages in full since they are the only ones known to me in Plautus. Ussing *ad* Asin. 235 (= 248 U) says "hoc = ideo" but I cannot regard the passage as an indisputable instance of the construction. Sentences of the type Stich. 127

Sed hoc est, quod ad uos uenio quodque esse
ambas conuentas uolo

(*cf.* Asin. 864; Merc. 711; Men. 1135) do not belong here, inasmuch as the passage Rud. 1258

Illuc est quod nos nequam seruis utimur

¹ All citations from Plautus follow the larger revision and completion of Ritschl's edition by Löwe, Götz and Schöll.

proves that this *hoc* is an Accusative. Slightly different is *Lucr.* 6,379, where Wakefield (*apud* Munro *ad loc.*) would take *hoc* in the causal sense. Munro is clearly right in rejecting this explanation of the word. In like manner the passage *Miles* 1321

Istuc crucior, a viro me tali abalienarier

shows that *Stichus* 9

.....sed *hoc*, *soror*, *crucior*:

Patrem tuom meumque....

(13,14)...*nunc inprobi uiri officio uti*

is to be excluded from this context. In *Stichus* 41

.....ego te *hoc*, *soror*, *tametsi es maior*,

Moneo ut tuom memineris officium

hoc is plainly Accusative. For *Miles* 297 see below p. 40.

There is to my knowledge no instance of this construction in Terence. Was the graceful imitator of the Greeks led by his love of *sermonis elegantia* to avoid the construction? The only passage that I can call into question is *Phor.* 804, and since the causal *hoc* does not occur in the *comicorum fragmenta*, Kiessling *ad Hor. Sat.* 1,2,53 "wie öfters in der Sprache der Komödie" should read "wie vereinzelt bei Plautus." A similar judgment must be passed upon Lorenz *ad Mil.* 850 "*hoc* = 'darum'; derselbe Abl. *Pseud.* 807; 822 und öfters." The only other examples which Hand, Tursellinus III,92 and 93 cites as certain are: *Lucr.* 4,555 (now 553); 660 (now 658); 624 (now 622); *Virg. Geo.* 2,425 (*Uss. ad Plaut. Aul.* 248 takes *Virg. Aen.* 9,492 in this way); *Plin. Epist.* 2,19,3 *hoc quod*; *Seruiana schol. ant. litt. ad Ecl.* 10,18 (*Duker pro-*

poses here *ob hoc* against the MSS). If to these we add Lucil. 6,29 (corrected by Müller to *hac*); Catullus 44,13 (where cod. Oxoniensis reads *h*=*hoc*); Lucr. 4, 360; 6,274; 864 (in all these instances, as in the cases cited by Hand, the word stands in the formula *hoc ubi*¹ at the beginning of a hexameter); 3,531 (where *hoc* is a conjecture of Munro for the MSS. reading *haec*.); Hor. Sat. 1,2,53f; 1,6,41; 1,7,10; we shall see that one may well question the correctness of Kiessling's procedure in making this construction characteristic of the language of comedy.

The construction was doubtless avoided on account of the phonetic identity of *hoc* Nom. and Acc. sg., *hoc* Abl. and *hoc* Adverb (= *huc*), which rendered the form ambiguous. Careful writers could therefore employ the form only where the context left no doubt as to its meaning. They could easily find substitutes for it in the causal expressions *ob hanc rem*, *ob hanc causam*, *de hac causa*, *hac causa* (later also *hinc*) and the like, or if necessary, in *qua causa*, *qua de causa*, *quam ob rem*, *etc.* It was no doubt in part this feeling that led to the juxtaposition of the Ablatives *ipso*, *solo*, *uno* and the superlative *maxime*, although, of course, no one would deny that these words at the same time intensify or otherwise modify the meaning of *hoc*. Another means of avoiding the locution was the phrase *ob hoc* discussed below, pp. 73ff. Ter. And. 268 offers *ex hoc*. The same purpose is imperfectly served by the addition of a *quod* clause (causal), although in

¹ Lucretius has similarly *hic ubi* at the beginning of a hexameter in 6,446; 524; 836; (*cf.* Hor. Epist. 2,2,136). In Lucretius 4,1093 *hoc* = "by this means."

some cases this clause is itself susceptible of a double interpretation, and more perfectly effected by the addition of a quia or a quom clause, which last form of correlation had a precursor in the Greek *τούτω διότι*, as exemplified in Antiphon *περὶ τ. Ἡρω. Φον. 3 τούτω ἐσώθησαν, διότι <εἶ> ἐψεύσαντο.*

The causal Ablative *eo* is slightly more common in its simplest form than is causal *hoc*. A typical example of this usage is Plaut. *Trin. 363 f.*

Nam sapiens quidem pol ipse fingit fortunam
sibi: [malust.

Eo non multa quae neuolt eueniunt, nisi fctor

The remaining instances in Plautus are: *Bacch. 298*

Non me fefellit, sensi: *eo* exanimatus fui;

Bacch. 95; Capt. 837; 860; Cist. 7 (bis); Poen. 288; Pers. 276; Rud. 876; Truc. 85. Trin. 372 (not 371) may perhaps be placed here. *Truculentus 180* is doubtless an interpolation.

Poen. 478 . . . uiscum legioni dedi

Fundasque: eo praesternebant folia farferi

is beyond doubt the right reading, but *eo* is here an Ablative of means. I believe Ussing's interpretation of *Asin. 435 (= 432U)* *eo* = "than he" is correct, but the parallels he cites are not appropriate and do not prove the point. There are to my knowledge only these eleven certain instances in Plautus.

From Terence I can cite only the passage *Hec. 238*

Enim lassam oppido aibant tum esse: eo ad eam non admissa sum.

The passage *Adel. 620* offers an instance of *eo* denot-

ing purpose or end, not cause. After Terence we first meet this pronoun in the Ciceronian age. For even assuming the correctness of the reading in Cato, *De Agr.* 22,3 (see Keil's critical note *ad loc.*), we must interpret it with Gottfr. Grosse (translation of Cato, Halle, 1787) and Holtze, *Syntax. prisc. script.* I,221 in the sense "for this purpose," "to this end" (Grosse: "die kosten dazu betragen . . ."). In fact, notwithstanding the statement of Kühner, *op. cit.* II, p. 745 (*cf.* Hand, *Turs.* II, 410) to the contrary, the usage is well attested for Cicero himself and for Sallust. The instances are: Cic. *De Div.* 2,46 *frater es; eo uereor*; *De Nat. Deor.* 2,30 *quocirca sapientem esse mundum necesse est, naturamque . . . perfectione rationis excellere, eoque deum esse mundum, omnemque uim mundi natura diuina continere*; *De Fin.* 3,16 *fieri autem non posset, ut appeterent aliquid, nisi sensum haberent sui eoque se diligerent*; Sallust, *Jug.* 42,1 *nobilitas noxia atque eo perculsa*; *Orat. Phil.* 13 (= Maurenbrecher *Fr.* 1,77,13) *antea malum publicum occulte, auxilia palam instruebatur, eo boni malos facile anteibant*. It does not occur in these two writers without the connectives *et*, *que* or *atque*. From this time on *eo* occurs in its simple form in all periods of the development of the language, at least down to Boethius (*De Consol. Phil.* 3,3^{pr},4).

Here should also find mention the formula *eo fit ut*, as in Cic. *Acad.* 2,66; *De Leg.* 3,39; Sallust, *Cat.* 52,23; 53,4. The familiar type of construction Plaut. *Most.* 636

Quid eost argento factum?

along with *hinc fit*, *inde fit*, *etc.*, would perhaps lead

one to suppose that the *eo* here expresses an idea of separation or of source rather than one of cause. Yet on the other hand, when we meet with such instances as *Plaut. Amph.* 756

Eo fit quia mihi plurimum credo

(*cf.* *Ter. Haut.* 505, in which *eo* is correlated with a causal conjunction), and such as *Plaut. Curc.* 61 *id eo fit, quia || ideo BEJ ||*, in which the subject of *fit* is expressed, we are led to conclude that the probabilities are at least as strong, that the Romans felt the causal force of the *eo* in this formula.¹

Those who wish to study this locution more in detail may consult the following passages: *Hor. Sat.* 1, 6,89; 1,9,55; 2,8,65; *Livy* 2,48,4; 3,66,4; 71,6; 4,7, 11; 10,9; 5,16,4; 17,10; 20,9; 46,9; 6,5,5; 7,8,5; 19, 5; 8,8,8; 17,8; 9,11,11; 36,4; 40,9; 22,47,5; 29,1,20; 20,1; 25,12; 30,42,16; (Observe that in *Livy* this construction is confined for the most part to the first decade—*Cf.* *Stacey, Die Entwicklung des livian. Stiles*, in *Archiv für latein. Lexikographie und Grammatik* X (1898), p. 17–82); *Velleius Pat.* 2,67,4; *Plin. Nat. Hist.* 24,62; *Quint.* 2,16,4; 17,7; 4,2,80 (*Bonnell* reads *aut*); 119; 3,3; 11,3,29; for *Tacitus* (about fifty instances) see *Gerber und Greef* p. 351; *Fronto* 24^m(N); *Apuleius, Apol.* pp. 500,17 (Paris edition of 1688); 509,2; 514,1; 525,8; *etc., etc.*; *Gellius* 11,9,1; *Censorinus, De Die Nat.* 18,8; 8,5; 14,2; *Victor, Historia Abbreviata* 15,3; 38,5; 39,20; 40,8.

As in the case of *hoc*, so in that of *eo*, ambiguity (since *eo* may mean “thither,” “to the end that”

¹ *Cf.* also *ita fit ut*.

—expressing purpose— or “hence,” with illative force) led to the infrequent use of the word, which was avoided by differentiation, giving rise to the forms *ideo* and *eo usque*. Still other expressions, such as *propterea*, *ob eam rem*, *ea causa*, *etc.*, and later *inde* and *ob id*, contributed to the disuse of *eo* causal.

From the foregoing, particularly from the infrequent occurrence of *hoc*, it is clear that we can speak of a rivalry between *hoc* and *eo* in the simple forms only in a limited sense. Both of these expressions are more frequently used in correlation with a causal or a conditional clause. In *Plaut. Mil.* 298

*Primumdum, si falso insimulas Philocomasium,
hoc perieris.*

hoc gathers up the cause just stated in conditional form (*cf.* below p. 47). The only passage in Plautus that can possibly be considered to exemplify the usage is that quoted by Hand, *op. cit.* p. 93, *Rud.* 388

*Hoc sese excruciat animi,
Quia leno ademit cistulam ei.*

Munro also *ad Lucr.* 3,531 cites this passage as an instance of causal *hoc*. The question may, however, be raised whether *hoc* is here Ablative or Accusative. A very close parallel is afforded by *Trin.* 1170

Quom ille itast ut eum esse nolo, id crucior,
the only difference being that this instance has the passive (middle?) voice instead of the active. Another type of construction which strongly confirms the assumption that *hoc* is Accusative, is that found in *Stichus* 9 ff. cited above, in which an epexegetical

Accusativus cum infinitivo stands in apposition with the *hoc*. This is evidently also the view of Kühner, *op. cit.* II, § 126,3,b, who cites Stich. 9 ff., Mil. 1321

Istuc crucior, a viro me tali abalienarier,
and Capt. 597 (should be 600)

Crucior lapidem non habere me,

under the rubric "Der Acc. cum Inf. steht . . . nach den verbis affectuum." The construction does not to my knowledge occur in Terence. In fact it is not until comparatively late in the period of the Silver Latinity that *hoc* . . . *quia*, *etc.*, becomes at all frequent. It is quite common in the Patristic literature from Cyprian on, usually in the correlation *hoc* . . . *quod*, in which case ambiguity is usually avoided by adding *ipso*. Cypr. Epist. 30,5*e* qui ruerunt, *hoc* ruerunt, *quod* caeca temeritate incauti fuerunt; 31,5*p* iam *hoc ipso quod* non cessimus, uicimus; 6*m* nec *hoc* animentur *quia* multi sunt, sed *hoc ipso* || *ipsud* T || magis reprimantur, *quia* non pauci sunt; Arnobius 2,2*p* uel *hoc ipso* . . . *quod* . . . , *quod* . . . ; Tertullian, Ad Nat. 1,5*p* cum tamen aliquos de nostris malos probatis, iam *hoc ipso* Christianos non probatis; Ambrosius Ex. 1,6,23(12 F) nam *hoc ipso quod* diuersae eadem sint naturae, simplicem . . . motum habere non possunt. Passages from pagan writers are Script. Hist. Augustae, Avid. Cas. 7,8; XXX Tyran. 26,7; Boeth. De Consol. 5,6*pr*,45.

Owing to the frequency of the correlative use of *is, eo* is far more common in this construction. It occurs in Plautus (*eo* . . . *quod* or *quia*): Asin. 620; 844; Bacch. 319; Capt. 70; 994; Cist. 237; 492;

Pers. 785; 834; Rud. 24; 1114; Stich. 177; Truc. 272; Vid. 70; in Terence (under the form *eo.... quod* or *eo.... quia*): Haut. 787; Eun. 415; Ad. 698; and in Cato, De Agr. 6,4 *eo quia*; 17,1 *eo quia || ea quae Jocundus ||*; 37,1 *quod....eo*. Here I would place also the passage from the Origines cited by Gellius 17,13,3 *non eos eo postremo scribo quin populi et boni et strenui sient*, "I mention them last not for this reason because they are not...." Gellius cites this passage in explanation of the *quin* in the sentence *non idcirco Isocrates causas non defendit, quin id utile esse et honestum existumaret*. "Isocrates' reason for refraining from the pleading of law suits was not that he thought it profitless and dishonorable." The usage is also found in Plautus¹ Trin. 341

Non *eo* haec dico *quin quae tu uis ego uelim et*
faciam lubens:

Sed....

The construction represents the more usual *non eo.... quia non* (compare Asin. 844), and is paralleled by Ter. Haut. 554

Neque *eo nunc* dico, quo quicquam illum sen-
serim;

Sed siquid, ne quid,

where an affirmative motive is stated, "I mention it now not that (because) I may have noticed anything

¹ On obtaining access, after much difficulty, to O. Kienitz, De *quin* particulae apud priscos scriptores Latinos usu (Carlsruhe, 1878), I notice that he brings (p. 21) the passage from Cato into connection with Plautus, Trin. 341.

in him, but....'', and with reversed order of the clauses, by Ter. Eun. 96 f,

Non pol, quo....plus....diligam,
Eo feci: sed....

A sed would naturally follow the two passages from Gellius. The second one (which Gellius cites first) bears on its face indications of being "made to order" by some rhetorician and not quoted from a work of literature. This construction is not recognized in Harpers' Lexicon, *sub voc.* quin. The correlation *eo....quod, etc.*, further occurs in Rhetorica ad Herennium 3,4,7 $\bar{p}$; in Cicero's orations thirteen times, in Nepos, Eun. 11,5 (see addendum, p. 219 *infra*); in Celsus, B'ks 1-5, seven times. Its association with *quod* was so common (the two words being either separated by intervening words or in juxtaposition), that the words coalesced both in form and meaning (*cf.* Ital. *ciò che < ecce + hoc + quod*) so that *eo quod* (causal) comes to be equivalent to *quod* (causal). This coalescence is convincingly proved by the circumstance that, after *quod*, *quia*, *quoniam* take on the usage *dico quod* (*quia, etc.*) *es(esse)t = dico esse*, *eo quod* is also (in late Latin) used in the same way—see S. Silviae Perigrinatio ad Loca Sancta 8,2 dicent *eo quod*, "they will say that"; 8,5 *retulit eo quod*. Particularly instructive is the New Testament passage Mark 9,26(25), where the following readings represent the original *ὥστε τοὺς πολλοὺς λέγειν ὅτι ἀπέθανεν*:

1 Vulgate: *ut multi dicerent quia mortuus est* (so cod. Brixianus f and the majority of the ante-Hieronymian translations, with either *est* or *esset*).

2 Cod. Veronensis b: dicerent eo quod mortuus esset.

In the S. Silviae Perigrin. the construction occurs pp. 48,27; 49,12; 58,9; 63,31; 64,13 and, with the infinitive, 66,6. In Justinian's Novellae eo quod is sometimes used to render *διότι*. In 679-680 A. D. in a judgment of Thierry III (printed in Lindsay, Handbook of Lat. Inscr. p. 127) occur the expressions dicerit eo quod porcione sua . . . retenirit and dedit in responsis eo quod ipsa terra . . . tenuerant. This coalescence justifies what would otherwise appear to be redundancy in the excerpta ex libr. glossar. apud Götz, Corpus V,215,5 lampadas solstitium estibum (*sic!*) . . . ideo lampadas dicitur eo quod ex eo die lampas solis . . . (*cf.* Isidore. De Nat. Rerum 8,2 solstitium autem aestium ideo lampas dicitur eo quod . . .; Etymol. 1,17,7 note a). See also Bonnet, Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours, p. 326. A similar cumulation of causal particles occurs in Isidore, Origines 1,4,16 a . . . in omnibus gentibus ideo prior est litterarum pro eo quod ipsa prior nascentibus uocem aperiat.

The gradually weakening eo was replaced, as has been implied above, by ob id, ob hoc, ideo, idcirco, propterea, ob eam rem (causam), and other causal expressions.

It is a matter of great difficulty, even if it is not impossible, for us to know whether the Romans felt any difference between the eo in the type of sentences just mentioned and that exemplified by Plaut. Aul. 240

Eo dico, ne me thensauros reperisse censeas;

and Ter. Phor. 745

Eo perperam olim dixi, ne uos....

Effutiretis,

in which *eo* looks forward to a purpose clause instead of a causal clause. The same difficulty arises in the case of the two correlations *hoc* (Abl.)....*quod* and *hoc* (Abl.)....*ut*(*ne*). However the case may stand, it is desirable for the purposes of modern grammatical study to draw a sharp distinction between the two constructions, and not to cite the latter type as an example of causal *eo* or *hoc*, as is sometimes done by modern writers.

This same uncertainty arises, when we inquire whether the Romans were conscious of a difference in meaning between the use of the Ablative in the form *eo* (*hoc*)....*quia*, and *eo* (*hoc*)....*si* (*quia*....*eo* (*hoc*) and *si*....*eo*(*hoc*)). If Nepos in a well known passage Hann. 2,6 used *cum* and *si* (apparently merely *varietatis causa*) to express two similar sets of relationships, with how much greater ease might a speaker have passed (either consciously or unconsciously) from *eo* (*hoc*)....*quia* to *eo* (*hoc*)....*si*! The construction occurs as early as Plautus (see Trin. 371(372?) || *eo om. cod. F* ||; Poen. 1194).

The answer to the question whether in these constructions *hoc* retains a strong demonstrative force, while *eo* remains purely correlative, is one which must have a more or less subjective coloring. Yet it is certain that *hoc* could not have been used extensively (and we are justified in assuming that it was used more extensively in the colloquial language than in the literary language) without sacrificing some, if not

all, of its demonstrative force. This statement holds true *mutatis mutandis* of the other formulae discussed in this chapter. In the case of the others, however, the rivalry of the two pronouns was sharper than in the present case, and the tendency to confusion greater.

NOTE.—Id causal or expressing purpose and hoc (Acc.) bearing the same meanings are of such infrequent occurrence that they need not be discussed here. Hand, *op. cit.*, does not mention them (he treats hoc causal throughout as an Ablative). The only(?) cases of this id in Plautus and Terence are: Plaut. Amph. 909; Capt. 680; Epid. 192; Mil. 1158; Terence, And. 157; 376; 414; Eun. 150; 323 (scholia, ed. Schlee p. 101,5 “*id*] propter hoc”); 393 (scholia, p. 102,1 “*id*] propter hoc”); 829 (scholia p. 109: “*id*] propter id”); 1005 (scholia, p. 112: “*id*] ideo”); Hec. 368; Phor. 259; Adel. 791 (scholia, p. 160,15). See further Kühner, *op. cit.* II, p. 212, Anm. 3.

2. *Eo cum comparativo = hoc cum comparativo.*

The instrumental construction “by this (so much) the more, less,” *etc.*, and the Ablative proper (separation) construction are here to be distinguished. Hoc (Abl.) plus ne facito is cited by Cicero from the lex XII tabularum (see Schöll p. 153) in De Leg. 2,59. Both constructions occur with hoc and eo in Plautus and Terence. The following are the passages:

A. Instrumental hoc: Plaut. Amph. 166 f.

...dura hoc || hec *codd.* EF; haec Z;
corr. Angelius || < magis > (*add.* Cam-
 erarius) servitus est

Quod noctesque diesque adsiduo satis super-
quest....

(254) Hoc adeo hoc commemini magis, quia illo
die inpransus fui;

Ter. Eun. 220 f.

PHAED. Opus faciam, ut defetiger usque, ingra-
tiis ut dormiam.

PARM. Uigilabis lassus: hoc plus facies.

B. Ablative hoc: Plaut. Curc. 670 f.

....Hoc prius uolo

Meam rem agere;

Pers. 764

....Oh, nihil hoc magis dulcest;

cf. Rud. 279

Neque hoc amplius....quicquamst;

Ter. And. 30 f.

....Quid est,

Quod tibi mea ars efficere hoc possit amplius?

C. Instrumental eo: Plaut. Aul. 376

Atque eo fuerunt cariora, aes non erat;

Cist. 298 f.

Uideo ego te Amoris ualde tactum toxico,

Adulescens; eo te magis uolo monitum.

Mil. 1080 Eo minus dixi, ne haec censeret me aduor-
sum se mentire;

Most. 763 f.

Nam ille eo maiore hinc opere sibi exemplum
petit,

Quia isti umbram audivit esse aestate perbonam;

so Men. 151; Merc. 971; Most. 902 a; Poen. 883; Rud.

92; Trin. 274; 856; (*cf.* Cist. 380 eo sum tardiuscula).
Ter, Ad. 698

Quia tam misere hoc esse cupio uerum, eo
uereor magis.

D. Ablative eo: Plaut. Mil. 926

Eo potuit hercle lepidius nil fieri;

Ter. Haut. 62 f.

.... Annos sexaginta natus es,

Aut plus eo, ut conicio....;

Hec. 421

Dies triginta aut plus eo in naui fui.

Cato has only hoc, and always in the phrase hoc amplius (= praeterea), De Agr. 57; 94; 142; 157, 10. In the Rhetorica ad Herennium, on the contrary, the hoc does not occur, while eo is found eight times, always as an instrumental.

From the very first we notice a discrimination between these two pronouns; we find the instrumental use predominant with eo, and the usage that is developed from the true Ablative predominant with hoc. This is very conspicuous in the case of Plautus and the Rhetorica ad Herennium. In Plautus there are twelve cases of instrumental eo to one of the true Abl. construction and two of instrumental hoc to three of the Abl. construction.

The distinction is still more apparent in the writings of Cicero. We find the true Ablative eo only half a dozen times in the orations, philosophical writings and the letters Ad Familiares and Ad Quintum Fratrem (*cf.* Acad. 2, 35 quid eo levius? De Fin. 1, 41 quid eo miserius dici aut fingi potest? De Nat. Deor. 3, 23 nihil est

eo (*sc.* mundo) melius: nihil est enim eo pulcrius). In contrast with this we find eo over one hundred and forty times as an instrumental. Similarly in Varro, *Res Rust.* eo = "than this" only once, 1,18,3 eo plus, but is used with the other meaning about fifteen times. Varro's use of the word is somewhat circumscribed. He joins it usually with magis, minus or facilius. Sallust likewise has in *Jug.* 80,6 eo amplius = plures denis, but with the other force eighteen times. Both Nepos and Livy (Books 41-45 are not included) use it only in this latter sense, nine times and one hundred times respectively. Celsus in books 1-3 follows Livy, using in all but one passage (1,*pr.* eo . . . magis quoniam) the relative quo instead of quia, quoniam, ne, *etc.*

With hoc we find the case entirely different. Cicero differs from Cato in that he uses hoc with the comparative supported by or introducing quia, quod, *etc.*, that is to say, in sharp rivalry with eo, in thirty-four passages in his orations (see Merguet, *Lex. sub voc.* II, p. 468, d, a), and in twenty-two passages in his philosophical writings (Merguet, II, p. 154,5, d, a). In the letters (only partially collated) it occurs in both senses (*Ad Fam.* 4,4,2 hoc ipso melior . . . quod; 11,29,3 hoc mihi gratius facere nihil potes;—the same words in 13,66,2; 74; 79; 16,22,2). Sallust avoided hoc entirely, always using ad hoc instead of hoc amplius and hoc plus. Varro, *Res Rust.* 3,10,3 has hoc minus and hoc plus Ablative. Nepos has it only three times: *Alc.* 11,2 hoc amplius; *Timoth.* 4,6 hoc plura . . . quod; *Dat.* 5,4 hoc maiore fore in discrimine, quod . . . Livy also only three times (books 41-45 are not in-

cluded) 1,23,8; 36,25,4; 38,26,7; being in each case translatable by "so much the." Celsus offers us 3,5 (= p. 83 D) hoc ipso peius....quod; 8,1 (= p. 326) quo latiora....sunt, hoc hebetiora. The lack of a stronger demonstrative force in the determinative makes its use as an instrumental Ablative impossible except in a few cases, while the weakening of the demonstrative force in hoc makes possible its use in the other sense.

The following passages will illustrate the close contact of the two constructions:

- | | |
|--|---|
| Valer. Max. 1, <i>pr.</i> mea par-
uitas eo iustius ad fauo-
rem tuum decucurrerit,
quo cetera diuinitas
opinionem colligitur. | 3,3 <i>Ext</i> ,1 rex, quo patien-
tia pueri magis delecta-
tus est, hoc et hoc A ²
certius perseuerantiae
experimentum sumere
uoluit. <i>cf.</i> 3,6,1; 4,7,2. |
| Plin. Nat. Hist. 8,1 quo
largiore aluntur lacte eo
tardiorum uisum accipi-
unt. | 10,175 omnia animalia quo
maior corpore, hoc mi-
nus fecunda. |
| 14,80 uinum omne dulce
minus odoratum, quo
tenuius eo odoratus. | 23,40 quo generosius ui-
num est, hoc magis ue-
tustate crassescit. |
| Sueton. Cal. 15 inferias..
instituit, et eo amplius
(=praeterea) matri Cir-
censes... | Jul. 38 nummos, quos pol-
licitus olim erat, uiritim
diuisit, et hoc amplius
centenos pro mora. |
| Florus 1,24(2,8),18 partem
....dari placuit eo li-
bentius, quod.... | 1,18(2,2),14 hoc inlustrior
noster (<i>sc.</i> exercitus),
quod.... |

Hoc amplius was a favorite and often employed phrase (beginning with Plaut. *Rud.* 279), and was used from Cicero (see Tull. 44; Phil. 13,50), and (?) Varro (*cf.* *Res. Rust.* 2,10,9) on, in the sense of *praeterea* or *ad hoc*. Instead of it, *eo amplius* appears unexpectedly in Suetonius (*vid. sup.*), Aggenus Urbicus, Tertullian, *De Pud.* 5 (= p. 226,20), Lucifer Caralitanus, *De Regibus Apostatis* 11 (= p. 61,24 H) and Gaius 2,172; 3,212. Instead of the usual *eo secius*, we meet in Lucan 1,315 *hoc secius*, doubtless due to the poet's strict avoidance of the determinative. Of the poets, Lucretius alone, to my knowledge, uses *eo* with the comparative. See 1,69 *eo magis*, with which compare 2,125 *hoc etiam magis*; 2,826f. *quanto.... | magis, hoc magis*, and Virg. *Aen.* 5,94 *hoc magis*; *Geor.* 4,248 *quo magis...., hoc acrius*.

3. *Id est and hoc est.*

Id est is doubtless the older of these two formulae. *Hoc est* is met for the first time in Lucilius 9,32 f.

....in praeposito per

Pelliciendo, *hoc est* inducendo geminato L.

Id est occurs for the first time in Cato, *De Agr.* 57 (three times). The real rivalry between them begins for us with the *Rhet. ad Herennium* and is, of course, confined to prose. Although *id est* stands nowhere in the work without a variant, yet the reading is scarcely to be rejected in 1,16,26*m* and should probably be retained in 1,6,10. *Hoc est* occurs seven times, serving always to define a general idea by 1) stating its component elements, as in 1,7,11*p* *hae tres utilitates tametsi in tota oratione sunt comparandae, hoc est, ut*

auditores sese perpetuo nobis attentos, dociles, benivolos praebeant, tamen....; *cf.* 2,14,21*p*; 2,30,48*p*; 3,8,15*e*; 3,9; 16*p*; or by 2) adding a result brought about by the idea defined, as 1,6,9*p* cum turpem causam habemus, hoc est, cum ipsa res animum auditoris a nobis alienat; 3,11,20 mollitudinem uocis, hoc est, ut eam torquere in dicendo nostro commodo possimus....faciet exercitatio; 4,1,1*e* does not here concern us (*cf.* Cic. De Nat. Deor. 1,98; Lael. 58; De Fin. 2,91; Tusc. Disp. 2,30). Id est is used in the same manner: 1) 1,16,26*m* inuenta ratione firmentum quaerendum est, id est, quod continet accusationem, quod adfertur contra rationem defensionis. 2) 1,6,10 si persuasus auditor < fuerit, id est, > si oratio aduersariorum fecerit fidem auditoribus.... With hoc est 4,1,1*e* may be compared id est 4,11*p*; 2,26,40.

In Cicero we find convincing evidence that the two phrases had fairly entered upon a course of rivalry that was to last over five hundred years. It is clear that Cicero carefully weighed the two formulae and adopted or rejected each at different periods in the development of his style. In his speeches down to the year 56 B. C. occurs only one unquestioned case of id est, Verr. 3,116, to which may possibly be added 3,67. Concerning the sentence id est....lex, in Frag. A, VII,29 (= B, 6,13 Orelli = pro Cornelio II, anno 65) Sigon. apud Orellium II (1883), p. 72,12 says "sustuli duas voces idest res, quae videntur in albo libri positae fuisse eis vocibus declarandis 'cum ea feratur' et locum hunc per se satis mendosum mendosiores reddunt." Hoc est, on the other hand, occurs Rosc. Amer. (anno 80) 87; 103; 117; Div. in Caecil. (anno

70) 11; Impeachment of Verres (*anno* 78) thirty-seven times; Tullio (*anno* 72) 50; Caecina (*anno* 69) eight times; Cluent. (*anno* 66) 148; De Leg. Agrar. (*anno* 63) 1,2; 2,31; Sulla (*anno* 62) 49; De Domo (*anno* 57) 78; Piso. (*anno* 55) (65)66; Milo. (*anno* 52) 24; Phil. (*anno* 44); 2,70. This last example "et consul et Antonius!" hoc est dicere: et consul et impudicissimus, et consul et homo nequissimus does not strictly speaking belong in the present category (*cf.* De Nat. Deor. 1,98 and the similar examples referred to on p. 54 *supra*), since hoc est dicere (*cf.* Ital. cioè dire) forms an independent sentence, in which hoc clearly retains its strong demonstrative force. In other words, fifty-three cases fall before and during the consulate, four after it. None are later than the year 52. To these fifty-seven we should add sixteen instances of hoc est in the De Inventione against one of id est. After the year 56 are found twenty-four instances of id est in the orations, eleven of them in the Philippics. If Cicero was consistent in abandoning hoc est in his later years, we should expect to find only id est in his philosophical writings, all of which fall in the fifties and the forties. As a matter of fact, id est occurs over a hundred times, hoc est only five times, four of these last being in his work De Fin. (2,16; 98; 4,56; 71) and one in the De Nat. Deor. (2,17). So also in his letters Ad Fam. hoc est occurs only twice 14,2,3 (*anno* 58); and 5,12,8 (*anno* 57). Id est stands 5,17,3 (*anno* 57) and in eleven other passages dating between the years 50 and 43¹.

¹Cicero's correspondents do not follow the orator in this particular. Hoc est was written by Asin. Pollio 10,32,2 (*anno* 43); Brutus, Ad Brutum 1,17,6 (*anno* 46); Caecina 6,7,4 (*anno* 46); Caelius 8,4,4; 8,9,3 (*anno* 51); Trebonius 12,16,1 (*anno* 44).

The same conditions are observable in the letters to Atticus and to Quintus. In the *De Oratore* (*anno* 55) *hoc est* occurs 1,180; 2,66. If in this formula *hoc* preserves to some extent its demonstrative force (and Cicero's consistent attitude would suggest that to him the two formulae were not strictly synonymous), the suggestion may with some hesitation be hazarded that *hoc est*, the stronger term, was found by Cicero more natural when in the height of his energy and power, while *id est* was a less forcible expression which he adopted after his spirits were crushed by his banishment. It may be objected to this explanation that it would be valid chiefly in explaining the usage in the orations and not so likely to hold true of the *De Inventione*. If we bring the use of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* into connection with that of Cicero, another explanation is suggested. The Auctor may have been under the influence of the Greek *τούτέστι* of his sources, and may thus have determined the usage of Cicero; or in view of the uncertainty of our knowledge of the relations of Cicero and the Auctor ad Herennium, it may be better to assume that the two writers were independently affected by Greek influence, to which Cicero's early training in rhetoric and philosophy exposed him. It may be unnecessary to assume the influence of any special book, since Cicero spoke Greek fluently. In this connection it is interesting to note that in the *Archiv für lat. Lexikogr. und Grammatik* X (1897), p. 478, Prof. J. C. Rolfe confirms (with additional evidence derived from the letters, philosophical and rhetorical works) the conclusions of H. Hellmuth (*Acta Sem. Erlangensis* 1, p. 120f.),

who, following up a suggestion of Wölfflin (Philologus XXXIV, 144), points out that between the years 62 and 54 B. C. Cicero gradually passed in his orations from the spelling *abs te* to *ab te*.

The consistency with which Cicero's successors in Roman literature adopted his later practice speaks well for the soundness of his judgment, and suggests that *id est* was the normal and natural phrase. Varro shows *id est* sixty-eight times, not including the doubtful passages, two in the *Res Rust.* ([3, 2, 18; 3, 16, 3]) and four in the *De Ling. Lat.*, Livy four times (9, 19, 7—Müller here omits *id est*—; 10, 8, 10; 37, 15; 21, 10, 8) in books 1–40, Vitruvius twelve times (see Nohl's index), Velleius Paterculus 2, 23, 6; 48, 4; 63, 3; Valerius Maximus 2, 4, 1; 6, 6, 5; 8, 7 *Ext.* 2; 8, 9, 1; and Petronius offers seven instances (see Segebadé u. Lommatzsch s. v.) while none of these writers use *hoc est*.

In Cæsar and Nepos both phrases are wanting. Sallust alone has an instance of *hoc est*: Jug. 31, 20 (in an oration) *uos autem, hoc est populus Romanus . . . satis habeatis*. In the same oration in § 26 *id est* occurs. The occurrence of *hoc est* in Catullus 83, 6 is not surprising in view of the results that we have reached in the first chapter.

A preference on the part of the writers of "Silver Latin" for *hic* over *is* makes itself felt from Seneca the Elder on, in the reappearance of *hoc est* (*cf.* Sen. Contr. 1, 1, 19). *Id est* occurs 9, 4, 11 and *hic pro patria fecerit, id est: an illo tempore . . .*; *cf.* 10, *pr.* 16; Exc. Contr. 7, 7. Ascon. Ped. in Pisonianam 52 has *hoc est*, and Seneca in *De Ben.*, *De Clem.*, *Ad Lucil.* returns to the later Ciceronian usage, showing 44 (+ ? 3) cases

of *id est*. In *De Ben.*, *De Clem.*, and *Ad Lucil.* 1-25 *hoc est* does not occur. Pliny, N. H. books 2,3,6-15, 23-30 has *hoc est* 39 times, *id est* 20 times. Frontinus, *De Aquis* 7 has *id est*; *De Contr. Agr.* p. 58, 14 (L) *hoc est*. Quintilian has *id est*: 3,7,15; 11,28; 9,4,80; 1,9,1; 5,49; 11,12; 3,5,4; 5,10,86; *etc.*; *hoc est*: 3,7,1; 7,1,14; 8,2,20; 8,3,89 (a citation from Cassius). Pliny's Letters show *id est* nine times, *hoc est* five times; Panegyri. *id est* twice, *hoc est* eight times.

The following conspectus shows the attitude of the later writers:

	ID EST	HOC EST
Balbus, Ad. Cels.	page 100,10	None.
Hyginus Grom. De Contr.		
Agr.	9 times.	None.
" " De Gen.		
Con.	5 times.	None.
" " De Lim.		
Const.	None.	P, 170,4; 171,4.
Siculus Flaccus	Over five times.	
Fronto [M. Aureli uerba]	p. 213 N.	
Gellius, Noct. Att.	ca. 46 times.	9 times.
Florus	10 times.	
" De Virg. Or. an P.	Once.	
Gaius	At least 29 times.	
Suetonius	10 times.	3 times.
Acro ad Horat.	3,5,23.	3,5,24.
" " Verr.	3,116.	
Decretum Commodi	Once.	
Censor. De Die Nat.	16 times.	5 times.
Porphyri. in Horat.	355 + 31 doubtful or spurious.	1; 79 + 12 doubtful or spurious.
Volus. Maecianus	11; 14; 15; 29; 46; 65 <i>bis</i> ; 71 <i>bis</i> ; 72.	9; 10; 12; 13; 15; 65 <i>quinquies</i> ; 69; 72; 73.
Script. Hist. Aug.	None.	Hadr. 10,2; Helius 2,6; 5,4; Did. 8,9; Pescen. 7,6; Ant. P. 2,8; 7,3; M. Aur. 5,5.
	None.	None.
	None.	None.
	Macrin. 8,4; Max. II 2,4; 28,8.	None.
	Gord. 2,2; 3,2; 5; 33,1.	Gord. 3,3.

	ID EST	HOC EST
Script. Hist. Aug.	Avid. Cas. [4,3.] Gall. 11,3; 21,5. XXX Tyr. 24,5; 32,5. Heliogab. 4,2; 3; 17,4. Alex. Sev. 15,3; 45,6; 61,2. Aurelian 22,1.	Avid. Cas. [3,7.] Gall. 6,2; 19,4. None. Heliogab. 24,3. <i>do.</i> 6,2; 25,7; 39,6. Aurelian 32,4. p. [16,4.]
Frontinus		8,25; 23,24; 62,3; 63,12; 74,2; 77,7; 89,16.
Agennus Urbicus	p. 17,21; 25,9.	None. Exc. Bob. V, p. 651 <i>bis</i> .
Eutropius	One.	Often. Passim.
Macrobius	At least 78 times.	Passim.
Boethius, De Consol.	2, <i>pr.</i> 11.	
“ De Arith.	Often.	
“ De Geom.	Passim.	
Justinian, Novellae (Authentica)	Passim.	Passim.
Cassiodorus	At least 15 times.	Once.
Jordanes	Passim.	None.
Schol. Gronov. in Cic.	30 times.	p. 392,41; 397,29 (Orelli).
Patristic Literature:		
Min. Fel.	6.	None.
Tertullian	20.	None.
Cyprian	11.	6.
Arnobius	10.	Once.
Lactantius	11.	Once.
Firm. Matern.	8.	4.
Ambrosius	8.	4.
Paulin, Nolan. ¹	12.	None.
Augustin, Epist.	Often.	Seldom.
Lucifer Car.	None.	7.
S. Silv. Peri.	“sescenties.” ²	“raro.” ²
Diaconi Lib.	116,5; 6; 13; 19; 118,6.	None.
Anton. Plac. It.	None.	184,3; 188,14; 19; 190,20; 15; (<i>om.</i> C.); 180,8; 163,7. 224,11; 228,1; 229, 5, <i>etc.</i>
Adamanus		Hoc est dicere 5.
Faustus	11.	
Planc. Fulg.	Often.	
Fulg. Episc.	Sup. Theb. p. 182,3; 5; 10; <i>etc.</i> , 28 times in all.	p. 183,9; 12.
Alcimus Avit.	14.	5.

The passages from the De Condic. Agr. are: pp. 114,8; 115,18 *centuriae*, *id est* plinthides, *hoc est* later-

¹ Epistulae 1-46.

² Geyer *in indice*.

culi; 116,13; 25; 117,3; 120,8; 18; 122,16; of the De Gen. Contr. pp. 125,14; 132,17; 133,1; [133,4]; 134,10. In the case of the De Lim. Const. the evidence confirms the view of a separate authorship for this work and for the De Contr. Agr. and the De Gen. Contr. The references to Siculus Flaccus are: pp. 146,8; 154, 20; 155,22; 161,19; 163,25. Kalb, Roms Juristen p. 75 writes concerning Gaius "Wohl von keinem Juristen annähernd so häufig wie bei G." Et hoc est quod uulgo dicitur occurs often, but hoc est as a parenthetical explanative seems to be foreign to him. In Suetonius id est occurs: Jul. 19; 56(*bis*); Oct. 26; 32; 88; Galb. 3; Domit. 17; frag. p. 293; 305; and hoc est: Tib. 24; Galb. 8; Vesp. 11. In Acro's commentary in Uerr. there are at least five further instances. For the Decretum Comm. see Bruns, Fontes p. 229,26. Hoc est is found in Censorinus, De Die Nat. 1,2; 8,6; 13,3; 14,10; 22,14. The figures for Porphyrio are based on Holder's index (1893). On Cassiodorius see Bayr. Gymn. = Blätt. 1898 (XXXIV), 559. The figures for the Schol. Gronov. were privately communicated by H. Stangl of Munich.

This collection of examples shows that from Pliny the Elder on down to the seventh century both formulae were current. The only prominent writers to avoid hoc est are: Tacitus, Florus, Gaius, Macrobius and Jordanes. Id est always remained the normal form and with a few exceptions the one more frequently employed. One might at first glance be led to suppose that these conditions are reflected in or confirmed by the definition "id est · hoc est" in Götz, Corp. Glos. IV, p. 350,27, in which id est serves as

lemma, and might therefore be supposed to be the more frequent expression. Yet the examination of a number of glosses of the same collection shows that the writer (or compiler) did not necessarily make this distinction. Many definitions appear in double form. Thus "ob · propter" and "propter · ob" are found, each in its alphabetical order. The translator of Justinian's *Novellae* felt *id est* to be the normal form, since in translating *τοὐτέστι* he uses *hoc est*, but writes *id est* when not under such influence, *e. g.*, in translating *δὴ* (47, 2 *pr.*) and in interpolating an explanation of a Greek word (29, 5 *pr.* = p. 222, 30 Schöll) *biocolytas* (*id est uiolentiarum inhibitores*). (On the contrary Ignatius, *Epist. ad Phil.* 12 interpolates an explanation of *ἀντίθεος* by means of *hoc est*. Here the codex Petavianus reads *id*).

The final triumph of *hoc est* is testified by the Italian cioè (< ecce + *hoc* + *est*).

To show how very close the words approach each other in meaning and usage, it is only necessary to cite a few parallel passages. For Cicero reference may be made to Klussmann, *Tulliana* (*Progr.*, Gera, 1887) p. 6 ff., who cites numerous instances without calling attention to any difference in meaning. The distinction with Cicero is, as we have seen above, in the main chronological and not semasiological.

Pliny the Elder.

2, 84	quam diapason	26, 103	phycos tha-
	harmoniam uocant, hoc		lassion, id est fucus
	est uniuersitatem con-		marinus.
	centus.		

11,266 . . . nisi quae pulmonem et arterias habeant, hoc est nisi quae spirent.

2,218 . . . pulsum uenarum, id est spiritus, magis sentiunt.

14,98 . . . labrusca, hoc est uite siluestri.

8,174 . . . ginnum, id est paruum mulum.

Numerous similar parallels might be adduced from Pliny.

Quintilian.

8,2,20 ἀδιανόγητα, hoc est quae uerbis aperta occultos sensus habent.

3,5,4 . . . de iure . . . de re; illud rationale, hoc legale genus Hermagoras atque eum secuti uocant, id est νομικὸν et λογικόν.

3,7,1 . . . quod genus uidetur Aristoteles atque eum secutus Theophrastus a parte negotiali, hoc est πραγματικῇ, remouisse.

Aulus Gellius.

19,1,18 τὰς τοιαύτας Φαντασίας, id est uisa istaec animi sui terrifica, non adrobat, hoc est οὐ συγκατατίθεται . . . ;

5,12,5 'Marspater,' hoc enim est (cf. 17,8,2 *id* enim est) 'Marspiter,' itemque Iouis 'Diespiter' appellatus, id est diei et lucis pater.

Cyprian.

De Domenica Oratione 17 quomodo in caelo, id est in nobis per fidem nostram uoluntas Dei facta est ut essemus e caelo, ita et in terra, hoc est in illis credere nolentibus fiat uoluntas Dei.

Ambrosius, Exameron.

1,1,1(B) artificem ad ex-	1,7,25(13F) materia, id
emplar, hoc est ideam	est ὕλη, sicut philoso-
intendentem.	phi dicunt.

Censorinus, De Die Nat.

1,2 τῶν μέσων, hoc est....	18,12 pentaeteridas....
media.	id est IV annorum cir-
	cuitus.

Macrobius, Som. Scip. 1,	Ennius, Sac. Hist. <i>apud</i>
3,7 φάντασμα uero, hoc	Lactant. Inst. 1,11,46
est uisum.	ZAN KPONOY id est La-
	tine Iuppiter Saturni.

Priscillian.

6,107 = p. 79,8 ex agnis et haedis, idest ex duobus in unum hominem nouum corporis et spiritus castificatione suscepta pascha domini et pascha nostrum, hoc est Christus in homine et homo inueniatur in Christo; p. 102,9 (*cf.* Psalm 59,11) circumuersa mundi || Greek, περιοχή; *varia lectio* circumstantia || idest perfidiae terra uincatur ut calciamento pedum domini, hoc est Euan-gelio pacis ostenso distruatur Dagon.

Macrobius.

Sat. 1,23,7 siue ἀπὸ τοῦ δαιομένου, id est καιομένου, seu ἀπὸ τοῦ δαιομένου, hoc est μεριζομένου.

Som. Scip. 1,5,17 in numeros pariter pares, hoc est in bis quaterna, ut....in numeros aequae pariter pares diuisio quoque ipsa soluatur, id est bis bina bis.

Lex Romana Visigothorum.

(Gai Inst. Tit. 8,3), p. 332 (Haenel) agnati sunt per uirilem sexum....coniuncti, id est consanguinei fra-

tres, hoc est, de uno patre nati. item patruus, id est, frater patris, fratris sui filio agnatus est. ipso modo sunt fratres patruales, hoc est, qui *etc.*

Similar parallels are of frequent occurrence and it is apparent that in many instances the writer has aimed only to secure variety of expression.

The chief uses of *id* (*hoc*) *est* are the following:

1. To translate a foreign word. Examples above. Add Tac. Ger. 40.
2. To give the application of a metaphorical expression. Varro, Res Rust. 3,4,1.
3. To explain a Latin expression by

a) giving a more familiar synonym. Varro, Res. Rust. 2,4,17 *frondere...id est frangere.*

b) 1) stating all its component parts. Auct. ad Heren. ll. cc. Cic. De Re Pub. 3,6 *quare qui utrumque uoluit et potuit, id est ut cum maiorum institutis tum doctrina se instrueret...*

2) *vice versa* stating a common characteristic of a number of particulars mentioned. Cic. Laelius 65 *simplicem praeterea et communem et consentientem, id est, qui rebus isdem moveatur, eligi par est.*

c) stating one or more of the component parts either 1) any chance one cited to illustrate the general expression: Varro, De Ling. Lat. 5,93 *artificibus maxima causa (sc. nominandi) ars, id est, ab arte medicina ut sit medicus dictus; so 10,40, where the formula approaches exempli gratia in meaning.*

or 2) that element which is

especially appropriate to the context, and to which the writer directs particular attention: Tac. Dial. 3,21; 9 *extr*; 22,8...orationibus, quas iam senior et iuxta finem uitae composuit, id est, postquam magis profecerat, usuque et experimentis didicerat quod optimum dicendi genus esset.

3) This often takes the form of a correction of a general statement: Plin. Nat. Hist. 2,131; Cic. Ad Fam. 14,2,3 quod de domo scribis, hoc est de area....

d) combining with a synonymous expression a statement of the ground (Cic. De Leg. 2,27) or purpose (object to be attained) for an action: Varro, Res Rust. 3,9,2...ornithoboscion instituere uolt, id est adhibita scientia ac cura ut capiant magnos fructus.

e) correcting a false application (intended to deceive) of a word by some other person. The implication is usually "A or B call it so and so, but if we should strip it of its fair appellation, we should find it in reality to be so and so" (*cf.* Klussmann, *Tulliana*): Cic. Verr. 3,67....cum apparitoribus, id est cum ui ac minis (Müller reads *eo* for *id est*); Milo. 24....ad praetoram gerendam, hoc est ad euertendam rem publicam, plenum annum et integrum. In the reverse order in Verr. 5,114.

It seems desirable at this point to call attention to the difference between *id est* and *idque*. They are not discriminated with sufficient care in Gudeman's note on Tac. Dial. 3,21 (in his larger edition p. 78). "In Germ. 40 *id est* = 'that is to say'. In other passages Tacitus uses '*idque*': Ann. IV,11; 39; XIII,45." The essential difference between Germ. 40 and the

passages Dial. 3,21; 9*extr*; 22,8 is clear from the preceding analysis. *Idque* in the passages cited introduces (like *καὶ ταῦτα*) words which describe the circumstances under which an action takes place. These are usually quite surprising or contrary to expectation (hence not usually implied in the term preceding *idque*, while with *id est*, *etc.*, the definition is rarely, if ever, contrary to what would be expected), and to them especial importance is attached. They are in no wise to be regarded as a definition or a translation of the first term, such as are introduced by *id est*, *hoc est*, *quod est* (*ὅ ἐστιν*).

4. *Ad id and ad hoc.*

In each of these phrases two meanings are to be distinguished. They are used to express purpose and as an equivalent to *praeterea*. In the latter sense *ad hoc* is used to the almost entire exclusion of *ad id*. Sallust, in whose works it makes its first appearance, was especially fond of it (Constans, *De Serm. Sall.* p. 132 "*Peculiari amore dilexit ac saepissime usurpavit, quam locutionem Lawsius parum recte contendit antiquorum imitationem redolere*"). Certain peculiarities of Sallust's usage are possibly due to the development of his style. In his *Bellum Catulinae*, his earliest work, it is in five cases (A) correlated with other adverbial expressions: 37 *primum omnium—deinde—praeterea—praeterea—ad hoc—*; 14,3 *praeterea—ad hoc—postremo—*; 17,4 *praeterea—ad hoc—praeterea—*; 21,4 *praeterea—ad hoc—*; 30,6 *ad hoc—itemque—*. (B) Not thus correlated it stands four times: 26,4; 31,3; 44,6; 53,3. In the *Bellum Jugur-*

thinum the latter, more independent usage predominates (6,1; 67,1; 85,4; 89,5; 96,2; 102,6), there being only three instances of the former: 6,3; 75,5; 111,2 *primo—praeterea—ad hoc—denique—*; the first two having *praeterea—ad hoc—*, while *ad hoc—ad hoc—* is used in 31,28. In his maturest work, the *Histories*, only (B) occurs. In group (A) it is used either to introduce a substantive or an entire sentence, the former invariably extended by an adjectival modifier, which is usually a relative clause. In group (B) it is not until the *Bellum Jugurthinum* that Sallust uses the phrase to introduce a substantive. So 2,2 *igitur praeclara facies, magnae diuitiae, ad hoc uis corporis et alia omnia huiusmodi breui dilabuntur, at....*; cf. 17,6. This is the only usage which occurs in the *Histories* (*Orat. Phil.* 21; *Fr. Hist.* 3,77,7 < *ad hoc* > a generally accepted conjecture of Kreysig, entirely conforms to the Sallustian usage). A transitional type is *Jug.* 91,5.

Nepos does not use the phrase, but it again finds favor with Livy, and was extensively used by later writers, especially by the historians Velleius Paterculus, Curtius (at least eight cases), Tacitus (eight occurrences), Suetonius and Florus (twelve times), as also by Pliny the Younger. The phrase is especially appropriate to narration and description.

In books 1-10, 21-40 of Livy's *History* (thirty-eight instances in all) it is in no single instance (40,25, 4 is not to the point) correlated with *praeterea* or another adverbial expression. It occurs both as introducing entire sentences (2,23,4; 6,12,6; 20,8; 9,24,6; 21,54,8; 55,7; 23,32,9; 28,35,2; 44,2; 5; 29,26,8; 30,

17,14; 32,17,15; 33,4,4; 9,11; 35,12,11; 38,5,5; 39,53,4; 40,25,4) and substantives (2,59,11; 5,16,2; 8,12,4; 23,22,3; 28,14,17; 29,4,6; 31,40,10; 33,19,10; 34,52,6; 36,40,12; 37,23,2; 38,17,4; 39,5,16). Rather loosely connected with the preceding words and forming a kind of after-thought attached to the completed sentence are 7,12,2 and particularly 30,34,1, in which the added element may be regarded as a distinct sentence with its verb suppressed for rhetorical effect. Our Paduan historian somewhat extends the functions of the phrase. He uses it to introduce an adjective (21,52,10 *sparsos et incompósitos, ad hoc grauis praeda plerosque* . . .) and a participle (21,31,11 . . . *amnis . . . pluribus . . . alueis fluens, . . . ad hoc saxa glareosa uoluens nihil . . . tutum . . . praebet*; 40,9 . . . *debilitati* . . .; *ad hoc praeusti artus* . . .; *cf.* 6,11,6; 32,17,15.) With him the substantive is rarely modified by a relative clause, and in one passage (an extremely rare case) the substantive stands entirely alone (28,14,17). In Sallust the grammatical form of the member introduced by *ad hoc* corresponds to that of the preceding member. Livy boldly varies the construction: 6,11,6 . . . *inflato animo, ad hoc uitio quoque ingenii uehemens et inpotens* . . .; 5,16,2 *multis simul bellis, Uolscorum . . . Aequorum . . . ad hoc Ueientique et Falisco . . . bello occupatos*; 33,19,10 . . . *cum classe . . . ad hoc leuioribus nauigiis* . . . In certain passages Livy seemed to feel that this formula was not sufficiently strong to meet his needs and has supported it by *etiam* (33,9,11) and *quoque* (*supra*). In 23,22,3 it seems to be scarcely stronger than simple *et*. The formula itself, however, serves as conjunction and is

not, like *praeterea* (in *Bell. Afr.* 19,1; 25,2; 50,2; *Afranius* 72), supported by *et* or *que* (as *Caes. Bell. Gall.* 3, 17,3; *Bell. Civ.* 2,35,5; 3,96,1) or used with the cor-relatives *cum* . . . *tum* (as in *Cicero*).

In the letters and *Panegyricus* of *Pliny* (fifteen cases) we find a return to the *Sallustian* usage *praeterea*—*ad hoc*. He has further 9,26,8f. *et rursus*—*et statim*— . . . *ex eadem nota*—*simile his*—*et ibidem*—*et*—*et deinceps*—*ad hoc*—*et mille talia* . . . New is the order: *ad hoc*—*praeterea* (2,11,10). He employs predominantly the substantive, and was particularly fond of the sentences like *Livy* 30,34,1. So: 2,14,1 *raro incidit* (*sc. causa*) . . . *insignis. ad hoc pauci* (*sc. nunc causas agunt*) *cum quibus iuuet dicere*; 2,11,10 *con-spectus augustissimus fuit. princeps praesidebat: erat enim consul. ad hoc Ianuarius mensis* . . . *celeberri-mus*; *Pan.* 77*m* *ad hoc tam adsiduus* . . . *ut*; 1, 22,4 *ad hoc quam parcus* (*sc. fuit*) . . . ; 6,33,4.

The *Tacitean* examples are with a single exception found in the *Annals*. The only peculiarity he shows in his usage of the phrase lies in the order of the words in *Hist.* 1,6,10 *multi ad hoc numeri e Germania ac Britannia et Illyrico, quos* . . . , which, with *Ann.* 12,20,5, offers the type of *Livy* 30,34,1. *Ad hoc* postpositive, of which I can cite only the two further examples *Florus* 1,24(2,8),16 *elephantis ad hoc inmensae magnitudinis* . . . ; *Suetonius, Nero* 46, 1 *terrebatur ad hoc eidentibus portentis* . . . is quite possibly due to the influence of the analogous use of *praeterea*. The main verb precedes it in *Cic. Sex. Rosc.* 100 *Audio praeterea* . . . ; *De Leg. Agr.* 2,32 *dat praeterea* . . . ; *Cluent.* 81 *accusatus est praeterea* . . .

Praeterea in Cicero and Cæsar is, in fact, as often postpositive as it is initial. The order Adjective—praeterea—Substantive (as above) was an especial favorite (so Cic. Verr. 2,170 multarum praeterea ciuitatum Numerous examples in Merguet's Lexica): so also Verr. 5,34 cuiusquam pr. dedecus; Sex. Rosc. 133 quid pr. caelati argenti and even Verr. 2,120 quod enim iste pr. genus. In all other cases Tacitus uses *ad hoc* to introduce an entire sentence 12,34,1; 13,34,14; 14,24,3; 31,15; 15,4,5; 38,13.

Florus like Livy, is fond of breaking the monotony of the exact grammatical conformity of the expressions preceding and following *ad hoc*. Examples are: 1,45(3,10),25 ciuitatem, uallo sudibus et fossa induc-toque fossae flumine, *ad hoc* XVIII castellis . . . circumdatam . . . domuit; 2,21(4,11),5 quippe a senis in nouenos remorum ordines, *ad hoc* turribus atque tabulatis adleuatae . . . ferebantur.

The two following correlations are new: 2,13(4,2), 40 nunc—nunc—*ad hoc*—iam uero; 2,13(4,2),91 *ad hoc*—nouissime—, to which may be added from Paulinus of Nola, Epist. 5,4(p. 27,13-17) praeterea—*ad hoc*—postea denique The other instances from Florus (he does not use *ad id* = praeterea nor *ad hoc* to express purpose) are 1,7(13),4; 24(2,8),3; (2,8),16 (postpositive); 34(2,18),10; (2,19),3; 38(3,3),13; 2,21(4,11),6.

Of the synonymous expressions, *hoc amplius* was the most extensively used. *Super haec* found favor with both Plinys (see Nat. Hist. 3,138; 7,98 and Epist. 8,4,2; 4,26,2). *Ad haec* occurs from Curtius to Boethius. *Ad huc* (with which *adde huc* could easily be

confused, especially when the following words were neuters) is very close to *ad hoc* in Sen. Nat. Quaest. 4,8 (other examples in Goelzer, *Grammaticae* in Sulp. Sev. Quaest. p. 92, Anm. 4), but ultimately became so weakened that Cyprian, *Ad Dem.* 12 could write *adhuc insuper*, and Alcimus Avitus, *Contr. Eut. Her.* I, p. 25, 15....*habemus hic adhuc amplius, quod mirari oportet.*

Ad hoc accedere (*cf.* Bell. Hisp. 41 *tum praeterea accedebat*) and the like do not, strictly speaking, belong here.

When *ad id* is used in this sense, it is followed, so far as I know, by the relative *quod*, so that *ad id quod* = *praeter id quod*.

To express purpose both phrases are extensively employed. The rivalry between them had not apparently begun in Cicero. In *Verr.* 3, 188; *De Re Pub.* 1, 58 *hoc* retains its full force as *πρωτότριτον*, while *ad id* is used by him normally with the relative *quod*. Neither Caesar nor Varro have *ad hoc*, although Caesar, *Bell. Civ.* 1, 81 has *ad id expeditiores* (corrected by Faern to *ad iter*), and Varro, *Res Rust.* 2 *pr.* 5 *ad id* (*i. e.*, *ad agrum stercorandum*) *pecus adpositum*. Nepos has neither. So the rivalry between the two phrases begins with Livy. Aside from 1, 8, 4 *ad id hominum* and 2, 3, 6; 4, 54, 5, in which cases it is followed by the relative *quod*, *ad id* occurs in Livy (books 1-10) about sixteen times. *Ad id* regularly completes the meaning of a past passive participle, *e. g.*, 1, 10, 5 *fabricato ad id apte ferculo*; 4, 37, 4 *ad id*

missi; 7,39,14 qui ad id missi erant; 5,24,4 triumphique ad id creati; 7,12,9 ad id accitus; 9,13,2 dato ad id signo; 9,26,16 ad id parum potentes. The intrusion of *hoc* in such contexts is seen by comparing any of the above passages with 1,47,9 alii iam ante ad hoc praeparati. Parallel are also 5,52,11 collegium ad id (*i. e.*, for celebrating newly introduced religious services) nouum condidimus and 4,34,6 nec lato satis ad hoc (*i. e.*, ut classi pugnari possit) amne. In 2,42,5 and 40,48,4 *id* and *hoc* respectively are strengthened by *ipsum*. Contrary to what might be expected, if *hoc* retained its full force, *ad hoc* does not in Livy look forward, as does *ad id* (see 6,42,1; 7,30,4 *ad id* ualere, ut), to a following clause. This usage occurs, however, in Pliny the Elder, books 9,13,23-30, and it finds application not only as in Livy in conjunction with the participium passivum (9,122 *ad hoc* productus; 29,34 *detonsam*) or activum (9,77 *ad hoc* sufficientibus) and adjectiva (28,42 *efficaciorem ad hoc*), but also (with the indicative as well as the participle) prepares the way for a following *ut* or *ne* (9,182 *ad hoc* prodest, *ne*; 27,146 *ad hoc* parens, *ut*). In 10,1 *ad hoc* datis pinnis, *ad hoc* = *praeterea*. In these books *ad id* occurs but three times (12,63 *porta ad id* una patente; 15,26 *optima laurus ad id* latifolia siluestris; 28,193 *efficacior ad id*), always referring to what precedes (*cf.* 9,86 *ad ea*). Pliny's preference for *ad hoc* may be compared with his preference for *hoc* est noted above. Conversely he uses *ob id* more freely than *ob hoc* (see below).

Curtius appears not to have used *ad id*, but resembles Pliny in the use of *ad hoc*, *e. g.*, 4,8,4 *ad hoc*

(*sc.* ut claustra Nili fluminis tueatur Polemon) XXX triremes datae; 5,5,22 C ad hoc electi sunt; 8,1,12 spatiosas ad hoc (*i. e.*, ad feras uenandas) eligunt siluas. Tacitus shows a decided preference for ad id to express purpose. It occurs Ann. 1,81,7 suam ad id curam; Hist. 2,22,9 contra praetoriani dispositos ad id ipsum molares....prouoluunt. Agr. 38,15 datae ad id uires.

Florus has no instance of ad id expressing purpose (neither does he use ad id = praeterea). In 2,17 (4,7),13 he uses in id missus for ad id missus.

Later writers use both forms. In general ad hoc is more common in the patristic literature.

Ad hoc looking forward to a following clause (consecutive) takes on the meaning of tam (ita), as in Lucifer Caralitanus, De Reg. Apost. 7(= p. 51,22) ad hoc sis post tanta funera tua superbus, ut aut audiens nos Dei sacerdotes temet conuertas ad Deum.

5. *Ob id and ob hoc.*

According to Reissinger, Ueber Bedeutung und Verwendung der Präpositionen ob und propter in älteren Latein p. 42 these two expressions occur for the first time in Cicero; in the orations only ob hoc (Caecin. 73 o rem praeclarum uobisque ob hoc retinendum, recuperatores || hoc *omit.* Tegerenseis ||), in the philosophical writings only ob id (always strengthened by ipsum, and in De Fin. 3,63; Tusc. Disp. 1,11; 13; 5,95 looking forward to quia or quod). In De Leg. 2,12 *id* is a conjecture of Lambin. In Ad Fam. 1,9,16 ob id ipsum is taken up by in quo....superasset. Sallust has et ob id Fr. Hist. 1,77,18

(= Orat. Phil. 18) and in no other instance. No other prose writer earlier than Livy uses the phrases. Ovid, *Met.* 12,91 has *ob hoc*, and Horace, *Ars Poet.* 393 *ob hoc*.

As in the case of *ad id* and *ad hoc*, so with the present formulae, the frequent use begins with Livy. In books 1-10, 21-40 *ob id* occurs thirteen times (+ *ob ea* three times), *ob hoc* five times (+ *ob haec* eighteen times). Livy, however, distinguishes carefully in usage between these two words. In all but two instances (25,16,3, where *ob* rests on conjecture [*cf.* Fleckeisens *Jahrb.* 1881, 683], and 34,42,6 *et cum ob id se pro ciuibus Romanis ferrent*) *ob id* is used to modify an adjective (including participles): 5,29,3 *seignius ob id ipsum*; 21,47,1 *et ob id aptos*; 25,13,7 *castigatus*; 23,13 *ob id ipsum intentius*; 35,7 *quietis*; 26,13,6 *diminuto*; 28,2,2 *occulta*; 31,31,16 *plures ob id ipsum*; 34,55,1 *indictarum*; 37,24,5 *celerius*; 39,19,5 *fraudi esset*. *Ob ea* is similarly used 8,15,5; 40,1,5. *Ea*, however, in 40,45,7 has a definite antecedent, *prodigia*. *Ob hoc* on the contrary is used only with the non-adjectival forms of the verb: 25,37,17 *ob hoc cum omnia neglecta apud hostes essent*; 30,30,28 *non nihil etiam ob hoc, quia...*; 34,4,15 *ne ob hoc ipsum contemnantur*; 50,4 *acclamarunt gratias se inter cetera etiam ob hoc agere, quod*; 39,4,7 *donec consuli ob hoc (proleptic) ipsum moranti Romam redire libitum esset*. *Ob haec* stands almost invariably at the beginning of a sentence, and refers to the content of the preceding sentence: 1,40,5 after three reasons are stated they are summed up by *ob haec ipsi regi insidiae parantur*. 3,53,2 *ob haec iis aduenientibus gratiae actae*. 21,

53,11 cum ob haec taliaque speraret (*cf.* 8,23,3 ob haec cum); 9,45,8 ob haec uolgo in conciliis iactata; 37,48,4 ob haec Aetolos sustulisse animos et adnuisse imperata facere; 5,51,1 et ob eadem haec; 9,38,9; 10,21,13; 21,50,11; 63,5; 27,30,1; 28,39,13 gratias actumlegatos. . . .misit; 32,22,12; 35,13,10; 37,34,8. The only exception seems to be 28,39,15 non grates tantum ob haec agere iussi sumus, sed. . . , since in 10,31,8 libri ob haec aditi, the word haec refers to a definite antecedent.

Seneca the Rhetorician in his use of ob id has kept closer to the correlative use of id by employing it only (he reads elsewhere id ipsum) when followed by a causal or substantive quia- or quod-clause (twelve cases: *Contr.* 1,1,13; 14; 4,6; 8,7; 2,1,20; 2,3,11; 14*bis*; 9,1,9; 10,5,15; *Exc. Contr.* 1,1). Ob hoc (ob hoc ipsum four times) is always used with a verbal form, nine times with damnare, accusare and petere (*Contr.* 1,1*pr.* 1,8,15 || ob hoc MSS. ab hoc *corr.* W. Müller || ; 2,1,34; 2,6,4; 5*tris*; 7,6,13*bis*; 9,5,8; 10,3,10 < ob > hoc || ob *suppl.* W. Müller || ; 11 ob < hoc >. *Exc. Contr.* 4,3 ob hoc quod; 4,5 ob hoc maxime quia; 1,7,14 ob hoc ipsum quod; 7,2,12 ob hoc ipsum quod; 10,2,17 ob hoc ipsum, without quod; 9,1,6 ob hoc uidelicet ipsum ut. . . .).

Valerius Maximus (4,1,7 ne ob id; 8,1,12 cum ob id; et ob id occurs: 2,10,7 (the codices Laur. and Bern. omit the et in this passage); 5,9,3; 6,1,7; 7,3*Exter*, 10; 8,14*Exter*,1; 9,3*Exter*,3) and Vell. Paterc. 2,112,2 show only ob id. Curtius agrees with Livy in using ob id with Adjectives and Participles, and ob hoc with the non-adjectival forms of the verb: 4,16,7 maiore et

ob id tutiore circuitu; 8,14,19 humo lubrica et ob id impediēte; 4,16,23 audum certaminis et ob id ipsum incautius; 4,10,22 nepos paruulus, ob id ipsum miserabilis, quod . . . ; 4,14,4 ob id ipsum, quod ignoti essent, ignobiles esse; 7,2,2 horum ob id ipsum melior est causa, quod ego . . . suspectus sum; 3,5,9 laxataque uis morbi ob hoc solum uidebatur, quia magnitudinem mali sentiebat; 6,3,13 . . . Dareum ob hoc uicimus, ut seruo eius traderemus imperium; 4,10,31 ob haec ipsa (*i. e.* conditions just described) amantis animus in sollicitudinem suspicionemque reuolutus est; 9,8,24 ob haec. In 10,5,5 id is adjectival. The single instance of ob ea is 6,8,3, a very unusual passage.

Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, books 2, 3, 6-15, 23-30, has ob id over fifty times, ob hoc fifteen times. Typical illustrations of his usage are: Ob id: 1) with Adjectives: 7,104 ob id . . . utilis; 11,41 ob id . . . simile; 11,249 ob id . . . pernicious; 9,9 Tiberio principi nuntiauit Olisiponensium legatio ob id (proleptic) missa uisum auditumque in quodam specu concha canentem Tritonem; 2) with Verbs: 2,43 captus . . . traditus; especially with verbs of naming: uocare (9,38; 109; 12,54), appellare (11,244), cognominare (7,68; 8,33 ob idque); 15,13. Ob hoc: 9,89 consecrantibus; 8,42 magna his libido (*sc. est*) . . . et ob hoc . . . ira; 11,99 appellatus; 2,146 quae ob hoc fingitur. Ob hoc occurs also 8,109; 122; 10,17; 212; 11,198; 13,28 *et al.*; et ob hoc: 12,45; ob hoc ipsum: 9,75. Both ob id and ob hoc are used by decided preference with the non-adjectival forms of the verb.

Frontinus has nothing new to tell us.

Pliny the Younger uses ob hoc exclusively, once

looking backward (5,19,6 sanguinem reiecit adque ob hoc in Aegyptum missus a me....), in all other instances pointing to a following quod (causal), ne or ut. The instances are 4,8,4 te quidem, ut scribis, ob hoc maxime delectat auguratus meus, quod....; 6,1,2 reuertar, uel ob hoc solum, ut experiar an....; 7,3,3 tempus est te reuisere molestias nostras, uel ob hoc solum, ne....; 7,7,2 te negotiis distinere ob hoc moleste fero, quod....non potes; Ad Traian. 29(38),2 ipse enim dubito ob hoc maxime, quod....; 75(79),2 quod in notitiam tuam perferendum existimaui ob hoc maxime, ut....; 49(53),1 est aedes uetustissima Matris Magnae aut reficienda aut transferenda; ob hoc praecipue, quod....

Tacitus has only ob id (since he writes ob haec instead of ob hoc) and this only in the Annals (*cf.* Wölfflin, Phil. XXV,XXVI,XXVII): 3,42,9 Iulius Indus....discors Floro et ob id nouandae operae audior; 3,75,9 sed Labeo incorrupta libertate, et ob id fama celebratior; 6,9,8 seu composerat quaedam in Gaium Cæsarem ut impudicum, siue ficto habita fides. atque ob id conuictu principis prohibitus cum....; 6,8,2 ausus est....M. Terentius, ob id reus, amplecti (*sc.* Seiani amicitiam); 6,25,12 actae ob id grates decretumque (*sc.* est); 14,60,7 actae ob id de ancillis quaestiones....; 2,35,4 Piso....ob id magis agendas (*sc.* res) censebat, ut....; 2,66,9 Cæsar....Pomponium Flaccum, ueterem stipendiis et arta cum rege amicitia eoque accommodatorem ad fallendum, ob id maxime Moesiae praefecit. Ob ea occurs Ann. 2, 87,3; 11,25,17. Ob haec occurs 12,65,3; 13,41,18; 14,64,10.

Suetonius has both phrases. He felt *id* to be so weak a word that he reinforces it with *ipsum*. Otho 1 *quamvis ob id ipsum* (quod praepositos suos occiderant) *promotos* (*sc. milites*) *in ampliorem gradum* . . . *sciret*; Julius 8 *colonias Latinas ad audendum aliquid concitasset, nisi consules* . . . *legiones paulisper ob id ipsum retinuisset*; Tib. 65 *collegam sibi adsumpsit* . . . *quem longo intervallo absens ob id ipsum suscepit*; Galba 10 . . . *adstante nobili puero, quem* . . . *ob id ipsum acciuerat, deploravit temporum statum*; Vitel. 14 *quosdam* . . . *ob id ipsum* ("simply on the charge") *quod* . . . , *interemit*. The only exception is Dom. 10 *impudicos probauerant et ob id* (n) *ullius momenti esse potuisse*. In the Lives of the Cæsars there are three instances of *ob hoc* (always *et ob hoc*): Aug. 94 *Augustum natum mense decimo, et ob hoc Apollinis filium existimatum*; Dom. 17 *professus* . . . *conspirationis indicium et ob hoc admissus*; Tib. 70 *imitatus* (*sc. Tiberius est*) *Euphorionem et Rhianum* . . . *et ob hoc plerique* . . . *multa de his ediderunt*; Frag. Gram. 3 *et ob hoc repudiatus*; 16 *suspectus* . . . *et ob hoc remotus*; Frag. Rhet. 5 *uel magis ob hoc*.

Of the later writers the following show only *ob hoc* (or *ob haec*):

Justin—in every case at the beginning of a sentence—(*ob hoc*: 12,3,7 *diebus natis*; 16,1,5 *gesturus*; *ob haec*: 12,6,15; 13,4; 17,2,15; 20,2,5). Script. Hist. Aug. (*ob hoc*: Hadr. 3,3; 10; M. Ant. 7,3; 14,5; Verus 3,6; Hel. 3,8; Commod. 4,8; Pert. 7,2; Did. Jul. 3,7; Sev. 9,10; Pesc. 2,3; Car. 3,3; 4,5; 8,3; Geta 2,2; 4; Heliog. 9,2; Alex. Sev. 63,5; Maximini 11,8; Gord. 28,5; Gall. 2,2; XXX Tyran. 22,3; and

one further passage; ob haec: Alex. Sev. 50,2). In this work atque ob hoc and et ob hoc are favorite phrases, and ob hoc tends to gravitate toward the following ut or quod, *etc.*, in some instances standing at the very end of its clause just before these conjunctions. De Viris Illustribus (ob hoc: 11,2; 26,3; ob haec: 33,10; 48,5; 56,5). Aur. Vict. Hist. Abbr. (20, 17 ob haec tanta; 39,41 ob ea).

Thus we see that within a period of four generations from their first appearance in the literature, these two phrases, probably following the analogy of the older phrases ob eam rem (eas res), ob eam causam, and of eo, ideo, propterea, *etc.*, developed a great variety of usages. The present sketch is of course only an outline. Their history can be written only by viewing them in connection with the other causal adverbs and adverbial phrases. By the time of Pliny the Younger both phrases had come to be so freely used that the individual writers show great variety in their employment.

